





BS

1565

.H818

1804



H O S E A.

TRANSLATED FROM THE HEBREW:

WITH

NOTES

EXPLANATORY AND CRITICAL:

SECOND EDITION, CORRECTED, WITH ADDITIONAL NOTES.

AND

A SERMON,

NOW FIRST PUBLISHED,

ON

CHRIST'S DESCENT INTO HELL.

BY SAMUEL, ^{Horsley} LATE LORD BISHOP OF ROCHESTER,
NOW OF ST. ASAPH.

L O N D O N:

PRINTED FOR J. HATCHARD, PICCADILLY; J. ROBSON, NEW BOND
STREET; F. C. AND J. RIVINGTON, ST. PAUL'S CHURCH YARD;
AND T. BECKET, PALL MALL;
BY NICHOLS AND SON, RED LION PASSAGE, FLEET STREET.

1804.

THE C. O. T. CO.

THE C. O. T. COMPANY

1880

THE C. O. T. CO.

THE C. O. T. COMPANY

THE C. O. T. COMPANY

1880

THE C. O. T. CO.

THE C. O. T. COMPANY

1880

THE C. O. T. CO.

THE C. O. T. COMPANY

1880

THE C. O. T. CO.

THE C. O. T. COMPANY

1880

THE C. O. T. CO.

THE C. O. T. COMPANY

1880

THE C. O. T. CO.

1880

TO
THE KING.

SIR,

YOUR MAJESTY'S love and affection for Letters in general, not the least conspicuous of the many Royal Virtues which have endeared you to mankind ; the particular favour and protection YOUR MAJESTY, upon all occasions, has vouchsafed to extend to Biblical Learning, have encouraged me to crave permission to approach your Royal Person, with my humble offering of an attempt to elucidate one of the most antient, generally deemed the most difficult, and for that reason, of late years, the most neglected, but certainly not the least interesting of the Hebrew Prophets. If the execution of the work might be supposed to be at all answerable to the dignity and moment of the sacred argument ; and, as far as may be attainable in a translation, to the force and sublimity of the stile in the original ; the present

A 2

might

WITHDRAWN

78316

might seem not too mean, to be brought before a Monarch, who has lived a bright example of Piety, in times when Piety has been generally laughed to scorn ; and will be recorded in the truth-telling page of History, as the Patron of the Sciences and the Arts, and, under God, the powerfull protector of the rights of Civil Government and of the Christian Church (Institutions in their origin equally divine) in an age when a general spirit of Anarchy and Atheism threatened to re-barbarize the life of fallen Man, by the subversion of all Social Order, by obliterating the natural distinctions of Right and Wrong, by the studied misuse and perversion of all Learning and Philosophy, and by the total extinction of all Religion. May YOUR MAJESTY be long preserved, by the ALMIGHTY, to be the resolute defender of the purity of our national Faith and Worship ; while the spirit of true Piety, even in the shade of private life, is cherished by the lustre of your great example ! That, after a lengthened Reign of Prosperity and Glory here, you may rise to the brighter Glories of that better Kingdom, which the God you have so faithfully served, as his Minister for Good to all your People, has prepared for them that love him.

YOUR MAJESTY'S

Molt dutifull Subject,

and most devoted Servant,

SAMUEL ROFFENS.

PRÉFACE.

HOSEA began to prophecy so early as in the days of the great-grandson of Jehu, Jeroboam, the second of that name King of Israel ; and he continued in the prophetic office in the successive reigns of Uzziah, Jotham, Ahaz, and Hezekiah, Kings of Judah. Since he prophesied not before the days of Uzziah, King of Judah, it must have been in the latter part of Jeroboam's reign, that the word of the Lord first came to him. For Jeroboam reigned in Israel 41 years in all^a ; and the accession of Uzziah, King of Judah, was in the 27th year of Jeroboam^b. We must look, therefore, for the commencement of Hosea's ministry within the last 14 years of Jeroboam ; and it cannot reasonably be supposed to have been earlier, than a year or two before that Monarch's death. For the interval from Jeroboam's death to the commencement of the reign of Hezekiah in Judah, upon the most probable supposition of the corresponding reigns in the two kingdoms of Judah and Israel, seems to have been no less than 68 years^c. If we increase the

The duration of
Hosea's ministry

^a 2 Kings xiv. 23.

^b xv. 1.

^c Archbishop Usher makes it no more than 57 or 58. But I am persuaded the death of Jeroboam was 7 years earlier, and the accession of Hezekiah 3 years later, than according to Archbishop Usher's dates.

P R E F A C E.

interval by the last year only of Jeroboam's reign, and the first of Hezekiah's (in the days of both which Kings he prophesied), we shall make a space of no less than 70 years, for the whole duration of Hosea's ministry. And since he was of age to chuse a wife for himself and to marry, when he first entered upon it, he must have lived to extreme old age. He must have attained his 100th year at least, if he saw the accomplishment of the judgement, he had been employed to denounce against the kingdom of Israel. But it is probable that he was removed, before that event took place. For, in all his prophecies, the kingdom of Samaria is mentioned, as sentenced indeed to excision ; but as yet subsisting, at the time when they were delivered.

His principal
subject, and his
peculiar charac-
ter as a Prophet.

Inasmuch as he reckons the time of his ministry, by the succession of the Kings of Judah, the learned have been induced to believe, that he himself belonged to that kingdom. However that may be, for we have no direct information of history upon the subject, it appears, that whether from the mere impulse of the Divine Spirit, or from family connections and attachments, he took a particular interest in the fortunes of the sister kingdom. For he describes, with much more exactness than any other Prophet, the distinct destinies of the two great branches of the chosen people, the different judgements impending on them, and the different manner of their final restoration ; and he is particularly pathetic, in the exhortations he addresses to the ten tribes. It is a great mistake, however, into which the most learned expositors have fallen, and it has been the occasion of much misinterpretation, to suppose, that " his prophecies are all 'most wholly against the kingdom of Israel ;'" or that the captivity of the ten tribes is the immediate and principal subject, the destiny of the two tribes being only occasionally introduced. Hosea's principal subject is that, which is the principal subject indeed of all the Prophets ; the guilt of the Jewish nation in general, their disobedient

ent

ent refractory spirit, the heavy judgements that awaited them, their final conversion to God, their re-establishment in the land of promise, and their restoration to God's favour, and to a condition of the greatest national prosperity, and of high pre-eminence among the nations of the earth, under the immediate protection of the Messiah, in the latter ages of the world. He confines himself more closely to this single subject, than any other Prophet. He seems, indeed, of all the Prophets, if I may so express my conception of his peculiar character, to have been the most of a Jew. Comparatively, he seems to care but little about other people. He wanders not like Isaiah, Jeremiah, and Ezekiel, into the collateral history of the surrounding heathen nations. He meddles not, like Daniel, with the revolutions of the great empires of the world. His own country seems to engross his whole attention ; her privileges, her crimes, her punishment, her pardon. He predicts, indeed, in the strongest and the clearest terms, the ingrafting of the Gentiles into the Church of God. But he mentions it only generally ; he enters not, like Isaiah, into a minute detail of the progress of the business. Nor does he describe, in any detail, the previous contest with the apostate faction in the latter ages. He makes no explicit mention of the share, which the converted Gentiles are to have in the re-establishment of the Natural Israel in their antient seats ; subjects which make so striking a part of the prophecies of Isaiah, Daniel, Zachariah, Haggai, and, occasionally, of the other Prophets. He alludes to the calling of our Lord from Egypt ; to the resurrection on the third day ; he touches, but only in general terms, upon the final overthrow of the Antichristian army in Palestine, by the immediate interposition of Jehovah ; and he celebrates, in the loftiest strains of triumph and exultation, the Saviour's final victory over Death and Hell. But yet, of all the Prophets, he certainly enters the least into the detail of the mysteries of Redemption. We have nothing in him descriptive of the events of the interval be-

tween the two advents of our Lord. Nothing diffuse and circumstantial, upon the great and interesting mysteries of the Incarnation, and the Atonement. His country, and his kindred, is the subject next his heart. Their crimes excite his indignation; their sufferings interest his pity; their future exaltation is the object, on which his imagination fixes with delight. It is a remarkable dispensation of Providence, that clear notices, though in general terms, of the universal redemption, should be found in a writer so strongly possessed with national partialities. This Judaism, if I may so call it, seems to make the particular character of Hosea as a Prophet. Not that the ten tribes are exclusively his subject. His country is indeed his particular and constant subject; but his country generally, in both its branches, not in either taken by itself.

His marriage a
real transaction.
The woman a
type of the whole
Jewish nation.

That this is the true view of his prophecies, appears from the extraordinary manner of the opening of his ministry. As an expositor of his prophecy, I might decline any discussion of the question about his marriage; whether it was a real transaction, or passed in vision only. I have indeed no doubt, that it was a real occurrence in the Prophet's life, and the beginning of his prophetic career. I have no doubt, that he was really commanded to form the connection; and that the commandment, in the sense in which it was given, was really obeyed. But this is, in truth, a question of little importance to the interpretation of the Prophecy. For the act was equally emblematical, whether it was real or visionary only. And the signification of the emblem, whether the act were done in reality or in vision, will be the same. The act, if merely visionary, will admit the same variety of circumstances in vision, as the real act would admit in reality. The same questions will arise, what those circumstances were. And the import of each circumstance, attending the act, will be the same, though not of the same public notoriety. The readiest and surest

way

way therefore of interpreting the prophecy will be to consider the emblematical act as really performed. The emblem was interpreted by the Holy Spirit, when he gave the command. The incontinent wife, by the declaration of the spirit, and by the general analogy of the prophetic imagery, was an emblem of the Jewish nation, polluted with spiritual fornication, i. e. with idolatry ; but of the nation generally, in both its branches, for in both its branches it was equally polluted. If there was any difference between Judah and Ephraim, it was not in the degree of the pollution. For in different periods of her history Judah had defiled herself with idolatry, in a degree that Ephraim could not easily surpass. But it was, indeed, an aggravation of Ephraim's guilt, that it was the very foundation of her polity. Her very existence, as a distinct kingdom, was founded on the idolatry of the calves, which was instituted by Jeroboam for preventing the return of the ten tribes to their allegiance to the house of David. These calves of Jeroboam's, by the way, seem to have been mutilated imitations of the cherubic emblems. Thus they were very significant symbols of a religion founded on misbelief, and upon the self-conceit of Natural Reason, discarding Revelation, and, by its own boasted powers, forming erroneous notions of the Godhead². This corrupt worship, as an essential part of their civil constitution, the ten tribes superadded to the guilt of a total defection from their allegiance to the house of David ; the type of the true David, from whom final

² The Cherubim of the Temple, and the calves of Dan and Bethel, were both hieroglyphical figures. The one, of God's institution ; the other, of Man's, in direct contravention of the second commandment. The cherub was a compound figure ; the calf, single. Jeroboam therefore and his subjects were Unitarians. And when his descendants added to the idolatry of the calves, the worship of Baal, they became Materialists. For the most antient Pagan idolatry was neither more nor less, than an allegorised Materialism. The deification of dead men was the corruption of later periods of idolatry, when idolaters had forgotten the meaning of their original symbols, and their original rites. It was not therefore without reason, that the antient fathers considered the nation of the ten tribes as a general type of heresy.

P R E F A C E.

apostacy will be everlasting destruction. The two tribes, on the contrary, remained loyally attached to David's family; and the idolatry into which, from time to time, they fell, was rather the lapse of individuals, than the premeditated policy of the nation. Except in the reigns of one or two of their very worst Kings, the public religion was the worship of the true God, according to the rites of his own appointment, by a priesthood of his own institution. And this was the reason that the kingdom of Judah, though severely punished, was however treated with longer forbearance; and, when the dreadfull judgement came, in some respects, with more lenity. But as to the degree of idolatry prevailing in either kingdom, estimated by the instances of it in the practice of individuals, it was equally gross. Accordingly, spiritual fornication is perpetually laid to the charge of the whole people, without distinction, by the Prophets; and in the nature of the thing, as well as by the declaration of the Spirit, the Prophet's incontinent wife is the general emblem of the whole Jewish nation. Whatever is said of this woman is to be applied to the whole nation, unless the application be limited, by the express mention of a part by name. And, upon this principle, we shall find that the whole discourse is general, from the end of the first chapter to the 14th verse of the fourth inclusive. In the 15th verse of the fourth chapter, the two kingdoms are distinguished. Thenceforward they are sometimes interchangeably, sometimes jointly, addressed; but the part which is common to both, with that which is peculiar to Judah, makes at least as large a portion of the whole remainder of the book, as what is peculiar to the kingdom of Israel.

Of the woman's
real character.

The woman being the emblem of the whole Jewish race, the several descriptions, or parts of the nation, are represented by the children, which she bore in the Prophet's house. But here two other questions arise, upon which expositors have been much divided.

1st. What

1st. What is the character intended of the woman? What are the fornications by which she is characterised? Are they acts of incontinence in the literal sense of the word, or something figuratively so called? And, 2dly, this guilt of literal or figurative incontinence, was it previous to the woman's marriage with the Prophet, or contracted after it?

The Hebrew phrase, “a wife of fornications,” taken literally, ^{A prostitute.} certainly describes a prostitute, and “children of fornications” are the offspring of a promiscuous commerce. Some, however, have thought that a wife of fornications may signify nothing worse “than “a wife taken from among the Israelites, who were remarkable for “spiritual fornication, or idolatry.” And that “children of fornications” may signify children born of such a mother, in such a country, and likely to grow up in the habit of idolatry themselves, by the force of ill example. God, contemplating with indignation the frequent disloyalty of that chosen nation, to which he was as it were a Husband, which owed him the fidelity of a wife, says to the Prophet, “Go join thyself in marriage to one of those who have “committed fornication against me, and raise up children who will “themselves swerve to idolatry.”² But the words thus interpreted contain a description only of public manners, without immediate application to the character of any individual, and the command to the Prophet will be nothing more than to take a wife.

But the words may be more literally taken, and yet the impropriety, as it should seem, of a dishonourable alliance formed by God's express command, as some have thought, avoided. Idolatry, by the principles on which it was founded, and by the licence and obscenity of its public rites, had a natural tendency to corrupt the morals of the sex; and it appears, by the Sacred History, that the prevalence of it among the Israelites was actually followed with this dreadfull effect. It may be supposed that, in the depraved state of

² See Abp. Necome on Hosea, I. 2.

public manners, the Prophet was afraid to form the nuptial connection, and purposed to devote himself to a single life: and that he is commanded by God to take his chance: upon this principle; that no dishonour, that might be put upon him by a lascivious wife, was to be compared with the affront daily put upon God by the idolatries of the chosen people. “ Go take thyself a wife among these “ wantons. Haply she may play thee false, and make thee father of a “ spurious brood. Am not I the Husband of a wife of fornications? “ My people daily go a whoring after the idols of the Heathen. Shall “ I, the God of Israel, bear this indignity, and shalt thou, a mortal “ man, proudly defy the calls of nature; fearing the disgrace of “ thy family, and the contamination of its blood, by a woman’s “ frailty ? ” But this interpretation differs from the former, only in the species of guilt imputed to the Israelites collectively; and the command to the Prophet is still nothing more than to venture upon a wife, ill-qualified as the women of his times in general were for the duties of the married state. And the injunction seems to be given for no other purpose, than to introduce a severe animadversion upon the Israelites, as infinitely more guilty with respect to God, than any adulteress among women with respect to her husband.

But it is evident, that “ a wife of fornications ” describes the sort of woman, with whom the Prophet is required to form the matrimonial connection. It expresses some quality in the woman, common perhaps to many women, but actually belonging to the Prophet’s wife in her individual character. And this quality was no other than gross incontinence in the literal meaning of the word: carnal, not spiritual fornication. The Prophet’s wife was, by the express declaration of the Spirit, to be the type or emblem of the Jewish nation, considered as the wife of God. The sin of the Jewish nation was idolatry, and the scriptural type of idolatry is carnal fornication; the woman therefore to typify the nation, must be guilty of the typical crime; and the only question that remains is,

whether

whether this stain upon her character was previous to her connection with the Prophet, or contracted afterwards?

I should much incline to the opinion of Diodati, that the expression, “a wife of whoredoms,” may be understood of a woman that was innocent at the time of her marriage, and proved false to the nuptial vow afterwards, could I agree to what is alleged in favour of that interpretation, by Dr. Wells and by Lowth the father, that it makes the parallel more exact between God and his backsliding people, the Prophet and his lascivious wife, than the contrary supposition of the woman’s previous impurity; especially if, with Dr. Wells, we make the further supposition, that the Prophet had previous warning of his wife’s irregularities. “Forasmuch as in like manner,” says Dr. Wells, “God took Israel to be his peculiar people, though “he also knew beforehand, that they would often prove false to him, “and fall into spiritual whoredom or idolatry.” It seems to me, on the contrary, that the Prophet’s marriage will be a more accurate type of the peculiar connection, which God vouchsafed to form between himself and the Israelites, upon the admission of the woman’s previous incontinence. God’s marriage with Israel was the institution of the Mosaic covenant at the time of the Exodus^a; but it is most certain, that the Israelites were previously tainted, in a very great degree, with the idolatry of Egypt^b; and they are repeatedly taxed with this by the Prophets, under the image of the incontinence of a young unmarried woman^c. To make the parallel therefore exact in every circumstance between the Prophet and his wife, God and Israel, the woman should have been addicted to pleasure before her marriage. The Prophet, not ignorant of her numerous criminal intrigues, and of the general levity of her character, should nevertheless offer her marriage, upon condition that she should renounce her follies, and

The woman in-
continent before
her marriage.

^a Jer. ii. 2.

^b Levit. xvii. 7. xviii. 3. Josh. xxiv. 14.

^c See Ezek. xxiii.

attach herself with fidelity to him as her husband : she should accept the unexpected offer, and make the fairest promises^a. The Prophet should complete the marriage-contract^b, and take the reformed harlot, with a numerous bastard offspring, to his own house. There she should bear children to the Prophet (as the antient Jewish church, amidst all her corruptions, bore many true sons of God) ; but in a little she should relapse to her former courses, and incur her husband's displeasure ; who yet should neither put her to death, according to the rigour of the law, nor finally and totally divorce her. Accordingly I am perswaded the phrases אִשָּׁה זָנוֹנִים and בָּנָי זָנוֹנִים are to be taken literally, “a wife of prostitution,” and “children of promiscuous commerce :” so taken, and only so taken, they produce the admirable parallel, we have described. The Prophet is commanded to take home a harlot for his wife, and receive her bastard brood. After the marriage she bears children in the Prophet's house ; but she is not constant to his bed. She, who at first was a fornicatress, becomes an adulteress (chap. iii.) ; yet her husband is not permitted to discard her. He removes her for a time from his bed ; debars her of all her intercourse with her lovers, but plainly bids her not despair of being re-admitted, after many days of mortification, upon her complete reformation, and the return of her affections to him, to the full rank and all the privileges of a Prophet's lawful blameless wife. If any one imagines, that the marriage of a Prophet with a harlot is something so contrary to moral purity, as in no case whatever to be justified, let him recollect the case of Salmon the Just, as he is stiled in the Targum upon Ruth, and Rahab the harlot. If that instance will not remove his scruples, he is at liberty to adopt the opinion, which I indeed reject, but many learned expositors have approved, that the whole was a transfaction in vision only, or in trance. I reject it, conceiving that whatever

^a Exod. xix. 8. xxiv. 3—7, Josh. xxiv. 24.

^b Deut. vii. 6. xxvi. 17—19.

was unfit to be really commanded, or really done, was not very fit to be presented, as commanded or as done, to the imagination of a Prophet in his holy trance. Since this therefore was fit to be imagined, which is the least that can be granted, it was fit (in my judgement), under all the circumstances of the case, to be done. The greatness of the occasion, the importance of the end, as I conceive, justified the command in this extraordinary instance. The command, if it was given, surely sanctified the action: and, upon these grounds, till I can meet with some other exposition, which may render this typical wedding equally significant of the thing to be typified by it in all its circumstances, I am content to take the fact plainly, as it is related, according to the natural import of the words of the narration; especially as this way of taking it will lead to the true meaning of the emblematical act, even if it was commanded and done only in vision. In taking it as a reality, I have with me the authority, not certainly of the majority, but of some of the most learned and cautious expositors: which I mention, not so much to sustain the truth of the opinion, as to protect myself, in the avowal of it, from injurious imputations. "Hæc sententia," says the learned Mercer, "magis nobis placet, ut reverâ uxorem "scortum duxerit, et ex eâ liberos dubios procreâret. Nam quod "objicitur, honestas esse oportere doctorum nuptias, sane non po- "terant non honestæ esse jubente Domino; qui id ita volebat ad sig- "nificantos Israelitarum mores. Denique aliorum interpretationes "tam improbables videntur, ut earum nullâ sit, cui majorem quam "huic assensum præbere queam. Hebræi enim scholiastæ hæc omnia "visione facta fuisse arbitrantur, cum nulla omnino visionis mentio "fiat." To the same purpose Mr. Lively: "Quod objicitur con- "tra legem Divinam et bonos mores hoc fieri, si doctor ecclesiæ me- "retricem ducat, tum verum est, si libidine suâ id fecerit injussu Dei; "quorum neutrum in Oseâ fuisse omnes intelligebant." And the learned Grotius: "Maimonides hæc vult contigisse εν τηλασίᾳ tan-

“ tum. Sed et sensus loci, et alia loca similia magis id credi exigunt, “ signo aliquo, in hominum oculos occurrente, expressas eas res quæ “ inter Deum et Hebræum populum agebantur. Uxorem ducere, “ quæ meretrix fuerit, non erat illicitum nisi sacerdotibus. Videri “ quidem id poterat subiturpe, sed quicquid jubet Deus, idem ju- “ bendo honestum facit.” The learned Houbigant adopts the same opinion ; which, among the antients, was strenuously maintained by St. Cyril of Alexandria, and by Theodoret, and entertained by St. Basil. And with these celebrated and judicious expositors, I scruple not to declare, that I agree. Admitting, however, in my own private judgement, the reality of the action, I would not be understood to admit, I do most explicitly and positively deny, as absurd and impious, the extravagant conclusion, which some have drawn from the mention of “ the children of promiscuous commerce,” that the Prophet was, either in vision or reality, commanded, or permitted, to cohabit with the woman, not as a wife in lawfull wedlock, but as a harlot ; and himself to beget an illegitimate race. Such a conversation of the Prophet with the harlot would have been no type of the spiritual marriage between God and the chosen people : it would have been highly sinfull ; what no occasion, or pretended end, could justify ; what God therefore never could command ; for, I admit the distinction of the learned Drusius, “ Scortum aliquis ducere potest sine “ peccato ; scortari non item.” The children of promiscuous commerce are the offspring of the woman in her dissolute life, previous to her connection with the Prophet.

Distinct parts of
the Jewish na-
tion typified by
the three chil-
dren; the whole
nation by the
mother.

After the marriage the Prophet's wife bore three children. These children represent, as I have observed, certain distinct parts or descriptions of the Jewish nation, of the whole of which the Mother was the emblem. Of these three children the eldest and the youngest were sons : the intermediate child was a daughter. The eldest, I think, was the Prophet's son ; but the two last were both bastards. In this I have the concurrence of Dr. Wells ; acutely remarking,

“ that

“ that whereas it is said, v. 3, that the Prophet’s wife ‘ conceived and bare a son *to Him*,’ it is said of the other two children only, ‘ that she conceived again and bare a daughter,’ v. 6; and ‘ she conceived and bare a son,’ v. 8; implying that the children, she ‘ then bare, not being born, like the first, to the Prophet, were ‘ not begotten by him.’” These things being premised, the names imposed upon the children, by God’s direction, sufficiently declare what particular parts of the Jewish nation were severally represented by them. The name of the eldest son was יְהוּאֵל Jezräel; compounded of the nouns זְרֻעָה (seed) and אֱלֹהִים (God): the initial י, being merely formative of the proper name, as in innumerable instances. (רְמִיהָ from עַקְבָּה, שְׁרָאֵל from שְׁרָה and אֱלֹהִים, יְהָנִיהָ from אָזְנָה and יְהָ &c.) The import therefore of the name is “ Seed of God;” and the persons represented by the Prophet’s proper son, to whom the name is given, were all those true servants of God, scattered among all the twelve tribes of Israel, who, in the times of the nation’s greatest depravity, worshiped the everlasting God, in the hope of the Redeemer to come. These were a holy seed; the genuine sons of God; begotten of him to a lively hope, and the early seed of that Church, which shall at last embrace all the families of the earth. These are Jezräel, typified by the Prophet’s own son and rightfull heir, as the children of God, and heirs of the promises.

This is St. Jerome’s interpretation of the word Jezräel as a mystical proper name; and, for the plain and obvious connection of the typical signification with the etymology and literal meaning, it is much to be preferred to another; which, however, has been received with approbation by many, I believe indeed by the majority, of later expositors. Conceiving that the word יְהָ, as a verb, signifies “ to scatter,” they render the word “ Jezräel” “ the dispersion,” or, the “ dispersed of God;” and they expound it as predictive of

Import of the
mystical name
Jezräel.

the dispersion of the Jewish nation: and this interpretation has been in so much credit, as to find its way into the marginal notes of the English Geneva Bible. And perhaps it is not altogether irreconcileable with etymology; for, the word *יְתִיר* is, indeed, both a noun and a verb. The noun is the root; and as the noun signifies “seed,” the verb signifies “to sow seed;” and, when applied to such seeds as are sown by scattering them, virtually indeed signifies to scatter them. Thus it acquires the sense of scattering abroad, as seed is scattered, and figuratively may signify the dispersion. But in truth, this interpretation of the word, however consistent it may be with etymological principles, is clearly set aside by the manifest application of it, in the 22d verse of the 2d chapter, in St. Jerome’s sense of seed; which in that passage is so evident, and indeed so necessary, that it is admitted there, by the most learned of those, who would impose the other sense upon it in the 1st chapter. They conceive the word susceptible of two contrary typical senses, corresponding respectively to the two contrary senses, which they ascribe to the root; namely, that of sowing for a crop, and that of scattering for destruction^a. The necessity of imposing contrary senses upon one and the same image, in a system of prophetic images, in different parts of the same prophecy, seems a sufficient confutation of the scheme of interpretation, which creates it. The sense, which forces itself upon the understanding of the reader, in one clear unequivocal passage, being equally apposite, though not of equal necessity, in every other passage where, the type is mentioned, ought in all reason to be taken every where as the single signification of the type; even, in preference to any other, which may not be irreconcileable, and may even be applicable, in some texts where the type is introduced.

^a Thus the learned Diodati, upon chap. ii. v. 22, — *ad Izreel*, “c. al mio popolo, il quale, Hos. 1. 4. “era stato nominato Izreel in senso di minaccia e di maladittione: nia qui è cangiato in “senso di gratia e di promessa: perciòche Izreel può anche significare, colui ch’Iddio semina, o “seminera.” And to the same effect Rivetus. “Mutatur hic significatio nominis ut pro disper-“sione a Deo facta non amplius accipiatur, sed pro seminatione Dei, pro legitimo semine.”

And

And for this reason, a third interpretation of this mystical word, which is adopted by two learned Commentators of our own, Mr. Lowth and Dr. Wells, must be rejected. The noun *yr* has indeed two senses. It signifies “an arm” as well as “seed.” Hence these expositors conceive, that *Jeziřael* may signify either “a Seed of God” or “the Arm of God.” And they take it in the first sense in chap. ii. 22, and in the second in chap. i. But since the first is the only sense, in which it can be taken, consistently with the context, in chap. ii. and is apt and applicable, wherever the word occurs; it is better to adhere to this one sense, than to introduce uncertainty and confusion, by multiplying the significations of a single image without necessity. Not to mention that the godly are often described in Scripture under the image of God’s children, whereas they are not “his arm,” more than any other part of the creation: being indeed the especial objects of his providence, but in common only with all his creatures, an instrument of his power. Rejecting therefore all other interpretations of this word, we may safely abide by St. Jerome’s, as plain and simple, agreeable to etymology, conformable to the usual imagery of holy writ, applicable in all the passages where this mystical name is used, and indisputably confirmed by the harmony and coherence of the prophetic text with itself. And, according to this interpretation, the Prophet’s eldest son, under the name of *Jeziřael*, typifies the true children of God among the natural Israel.

All of the Jewish people that were not *Jeziřael*, those who were not Israel, though they were of Israel, are typified by the two bastard children. The first of these, the daughter, was called *Lo-ruhamah*. The sex of the child is the emblem of weakness^a. Her

Lo-ruhamah
explained.

^a “ *Nequaquam jam Jeziřael, id est, “Semen Dei,” nec masculini sexūs filius nascitur, sed filia; id est fœmina, fragilis sexūs, et quæ victorum pateat contumelias.* ” Hieron. ad locum.

name, Lo ruhamah, is a compound of the negative particle לא, and רָחָם the participle Benoni feminine in Puhal of the verb רָחַם, which signifies either to be tenderly affected with love or pity, or to be the object of such tender affection, i. e. either actively to love, or pity, or passively to be beloved, or to be pitied. The name Lo-ruhamah therefore is “unbeloved,” or “unpitied,” or, as it is paraphrased in the margin of our English Bible, in conformity with all the ancient versions, “not-having-obtained-mercy.” Or, as it is rendered by the LXX and St. Peter, εἰκὸν ἀλεημένη. (1. Pet. II. 10.) By St. Paul, εἰκὼν ἀγαπημένη, Rom. IX. 25. It is remarkable that, of the two senses which the word רָחָם equally bears, of pity or love, St. Peter in this place should take the one, St. Paul the other; but this, as Dr. Pocock observes, “makes no difference in the matter, inasmuch as “God’s mercy and love go inseparably together.” However, the sense of mercy or pity, in his judgement, seems more agreeable to what follows. In which, however, I differ from him; for, the word, in its primary meaning, more specifically relates to the natural affection, the *soror* of a parent for a child: and, when it signifies pity or mercy, it is such sort and degree of pity as arises from parental tenderness. So that, if a choice is to be made between the two renderings, I prefer St. Paul’s; “not beloved.” Which is the more to be attended to, because it seems to have been his own; as all the ancient versions give the other. And St. Paul’s rendering is, in this instance, to be preferred to St. Peter’s, because St. Paul expressly cites; St. Peter only alludes. This daughter, Lo-ruhamah, typifies the people of the ten tribes in the enfeebled state of their declining monarchy, torn by intestine commotions and perpetual revolutions, harassed by powerful invaders, impoverished by their tyrannical exactions, and condemned by the just sentence of God to utter excision as a distinct kingdom, without hope of restoration: for so the type is explained by the Holy Spirit himself.

The

The last child is a son, and the name given him is Lo-ammi. To determine what is represented by this child (since in the application of this type, the sacred text is not so explicit as in the former), we must take into consideration the time of its birth. The daughter Lo-ruhamah was weaned, before the woman conceived this son. "A child, when it is weaned," says St. Jerome, "leaves the mother; is not nourished with the parent's milk; is sustained with extraneous aliments." This aptly represents the condition of the ten tribes expelled from their own country, dispersed in foreign lands, no longer nourished with the spiritual food of divine truth by the ministry of the Prophets, and destitute of any better guide than Natural Reason and Heathen Philosophy. The deportation of the ten tribes, by which they were reduced to this miserable condition, and deprived of what remained to them, in their worst state of willfull corruption, of the spiritual privileges of the chosen race, was, in St. Jerome's notion of the prophecy, the weaning of Lo-ruhamah. The child, conceived after Lo-ruhamah was thus weaned, must typify the people of the kingdom of Judah, in the subsequent periods of their history. Or rather this child typifies the whole nation of the children of Israel, reduced, in its external form, by the captivity of the ten tribes, to that single kingdom. The sex represents a considerable degree of national strength and vigour, remaining in this branch of the Jewish people, very different from the exhausted state of the other kingdom previous to its fall. Nor have the two tribes ever suffered so total an excision. The ten were absolutely lost in the world, soon after their captivity. They have been no where to be found for many ages, and know not where to find themselves: though we are assured they will be found again of God, in the day when he shall make up his jewels. But the people of Judah have never ceased totally to be. In captivity at Babylon they lived a separate race, respected by their conquerors. From that captivity they returned. They became an opulent and powerfull state; formidable

Lo-ammi ex-
plained.

at times to the rival powers of Syria and Egypt; and held in no small consideration by the Roman people, and the first Emperors of Rome. And even in their present state of ruin and degradation, without territory, and without a polity of their own, such is the masculine strength of suffering, with which they are endued, they are still extant in the world, as a separate race, but not as God's people, otherwise than as they are reserved for signal mercy; God grant it may be in no very distant period! But at present they are Lo-ammi. **אֲלֹא** (Not) **אַנְתָּם** (My people). And so they have actually been more than seventeen centuries and a half; and to this condition they were condemned, when this Prophecy was delivered.

Proof of this explanation of the name Lo-ammi.

That these are typified by the child Lo-ammi appears, from the application of that name, in the 10th verse, to the Children of Israel generally. Whence it seems to follow, that the degenerate people of Judah were implicated in the threatenings contained in the former part of the chapter. But in those threatenings they cannot be implicated, unless they are typified in some one or more of the typical children. But they are not typified in Jezräel; for the Jezräel is no object of wrath or threatening: not in Lo-ruhamah; for Lo-ruhamah typifies the kingdom of the ten tribes exclusively: of necessity, therefore, in Lo-ammi.

Another proof.

The same conclusion may be drawn, from the use of the second person plural in the explanation of the name Lo-ammi, in the 9th verse. "Call his name Lo-ammi; for **תֱּאַמְּנֵה** are not my people —." It is evident, that the pronoun of the second person plural, **תֱּאַמְּנֵה**, is compellative of the persons typified by the child, to which the name is given. The command to name every one of the children is addressed to the Prophet, by the verb imperative in the singular number.

ber. “Call his name Jezräel ^a.” “Call her name Lo-ruha-
“mah ^b.” “Call his name Lo-ammi ^c.” But in ex-
plaining the name Lo-ruhamah, the persons typified are mentioned
in the third person, “— for I will no more have mercy
“upon —” not *You*, but “the house of Israel ^d.” Whereas in
explaining the name Lo-ammi, the persons typified are not men-
tioned in the third person, but addressed in the second, “— for
“ye are not my people.” The reason of which I think must be
this: since the Prophet is the person, and the only person, to
whom, as actually present, God speaks; the persons of whom this is
declared, “ye are not my people,” must be that branch of the Jewish
nation, to which the Prophet himself belonged. Hence, if there be
any truth in the received opinion, that the Prophet Hosea was of
the kingdom of Judah, the men of that kingdom must be the per-
sons typically represented by Lo-ammi. “Call his name Lo-am-
“mi; for ye, O Men of Judah, are not my people.” This I con-
sider as a strong corroboration, though by itself it would not
amount to proof, of what I conceive to be indisputably proved
by the argument from the 10th verse; that the child Lo-ammi repre-
sents the Jewish nation, existing in the single kingdom of Judah,
after the captivity of the ten tribes. Or, to put the argument in a
stronger shape, independent of any previous assumption about the
Prophet’s country; since God, speaking to the Prophet, speaks of
the persons typified by Lo-ruhamah in the third person, and ad-
dresses those typified by Lo-ammi in the second; the Prophet did
not belong to any branch of the nation, collectively typified by
Lo-ruhamah: Lo-ammi typified some branch of the nation, to
which he did belong. Lo-ruhamah typified the Kingdom of Israel.
To that kingdom therefore the Prophet did not belong. He be-

^a v. 4.^b v. 6.^c v. 9.^d v. 6.

longed therefore of necessity to the kingdom of Judah. Lo-ammi therefore typifies this kingdom.

Objection answered.

The objection, which has been brought against this interpretation of the woman's last child, from St. Peter's application of the latter part of the 10th verse to the converted Jews of the Asiatic dispersion, has little weight with me; though it appears, that it was deemed insurmountable by so great a man as Dr. Pocock. The destruction of Jerusalem, and the dispersion of the nation by the Romans, had not taken place, it is observed, when St. Peter made the application of the terms of Lo-ammi, and Lo-ruhamah, Ammi and Ruhamah, to these converts; the former, in their state of unbelief; the latter, in their converted state. The Jews, therefore, of Judah and Benjamin had not yet lost the character of God's people. Yet the prophecy, in the Apostle's judgement, was already fulfilled; as appears by his citation of it, both in the comminatory and the promissory part. The Jews therefore of Judah and Benjamin, whom the threatened punishment had not yet overtaken, were not the Lo-ammi of the Prophet; but this child was only another type of the ten tribes, in their outcast state. It would be difficult, I apprehend, to prove, what this argument tacitly assumes; that "the strangers scattered throughout Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, and Bithynia," to whom St. Peter writes, were descendants of the captivity of the ten tribes, rather than of those families of Judah and Benjamin, which never returned from the Babylonian captivity; which were very numerous. Besides, St. Peter's application of the prophecy is no argument that he thought it any farther then fulfilled, than in the individuals to whom he applies it; or otherwise in them, than in a spiritual sense. There have been in all times, in one part or another of the Jewish nation, those among them, who, in a spiritual sense, were Ammi and Ruhamah; the same who have, at different times, composed the Jezräel, which

at no time has totally failed. Such were the converts of the Jews in the Apostolic age. And of this class is every Jew, in every period of the world, when he is brought to look, with the eye of faith, upon him whom they pierced. The Apostle's application of these terms to the converts of his own times, affords no argument that he thought the prophecy had already received its accomplishment, as it respects the national condition of the whole, or either branch of the Natural Israel.

From this view of the wife of fornications and her three children, the general subject of the prophecy appears, by the manner of its opening, to be the fortunes of the whole Jewish nation in its two great branches; not the particular concerns (and least of all the particular temporal concerns) of either branch exclusively. And to this grand opening the whole sequel of the prophecy corresponds. In setting forth the vices of the people, the picture is chiefly taken, as might naturally be expected, from the manners of the Prophet's own times: in part of which the corruption, in either kingdom, was at the greatest height: after the death of Jeroboam, in the kingdom of Israel; in the reign of Ahaz, in the kingdom of Judah. And there is occasionally much allusion, sometimes predictive allusion, to the principal events of the Prophet's times. And much more to the events in the kingdom of Israel, than to those in Judah. Perhaps, because the danger being more immediately imminent in the former kingdom, the state of things in that was more alarming, and the occurrences, for that reason, more interesting. Still the history of his own times in detail, in either kingdom, is not the Prophet's subject. It furnishes similes and allusions, but it makes no considerable part, indeed it makes no part at all, of the action (if I may so call it) of the poem. The action lies in events beyond the Prophet's times; the commencement indeed within them; but the termination, in times yet future;

General subject
of the prophecy
the fortunes of
the whole Jew-
ish nation.

future ; and, although we may hope the contrary, for aught we know with certainty, remote. The deposition of Jehu's family, by the murther of Zedekiah, the son and successor of Jeroboam, was the commencement ; the termination will be the restoration of the whole Jewish nation under one head, in the latter days, in the great day of Jezräel ; and the intermediate parts of the action are the judgments, which were to fall, and accordingly have fallen, upon the two distinct kingdoms of Israel and Judah, typified by Lo-ruhamah and Lo-ammi.

M interpretation arising from a prejudice against the literal sense of the prophecies which relate to the final restoration of the Jews.

A prejudice, which for a long time possessed the minds of Christians, against the literal sense of the prophecies relating to the future exaltation of the Jewish nation, gave occasion to a false scheme of interpretation ; which, assuming it as a principle, that prophecy, under the old dispensation, looked forward to nothing beyond the abrogation of the Mosaic ritual and the dispersion of the Jews by the Romans, either wrested every thing to the history antecedent to that epoch, and, generally, as near as possible to the Prophet's times (as if it were not the gift and business of a Prophet to see far before him), or, by figurative interpretations, for the most part forced and unnatural, applied, what could not be so wrested, to the Christian Church : and rarely to the Christian Church on earth, but to the condition of the glorified Saints in Heaven. This method of exposition, while it prevailed generally, and it is not yet sufficiently exploded, wrapt the writings of all the Prophets in tenfold obscurity, and those of Hosea more than the rest. Because, what with all the Prophets was the principal, with him is the single subject. It might have been expected, that when once the principle was understood to be false, a better system of interpretation would have been immediately adopted. But this has only partially taken place. Expositions of many passages upon the erroneous scheme had obtained a general currency in the world, and were supported

supported by the authority of great names. Amongst ourselves, it has long been the persuasion of our best Biblical scholars and ablest Divines, that the restoration of the Jews is a principal article of prophecy, being indeed a principal branch of the great scheme of general Redemption. Notwithstanding this, we have followed expositors, who had a contrary prejudice, with too much deference to their authority ; and, discarding their principle, have, in too many instances, sitten down content with the interpretations they have given us. Dr. Wells, himself an assertor of the literal sense of many texts relating to the final restoration of the Jewish nation, was nevertheless so wedded to the notion, that the particular accomplishment of Hosea's prophecies was to be looked for in the minute detail of the history of the kingdom of Israel, in the Prophet's own times, or the times next to them ; that he conceived it necessary to the interpretation of them, to ascertain to what particular reigns the particular parts belong ; rightly considering the entire book, as a collection of prophecies delivered at different periods of Hosea's long ministry. These periods he has endeavoured to distinguish, with much learning and critical ability, though not perhaps with entire success. But when this is done, he is under the necessity of supplying circumstances in the history by mere conjecture, in order to make the event and the prediction correspond. That is, in truth, he is forced to invent history, before he can find the completion of the Prophecy in the times, in which he seeks it. As when to bend a particular text, in itself not difficult of exposition as a general moral image, to his particular system, he is obliged to imagine, without a shadow of authority from sacred history, that the father of Pekah, the last King of Israel but one, was by trade a baker !

He divides the whole book into five sections, each containing, as he supposes, the prophecies of a particular period ; and all together

Uncertainty of
Dr. Wells's
chronological
sections.

ther giving the prophecies, in the order of time in which he conceives they were delivered. His first section comprehends the three first chapters of the book; and contains the prophecies delivered in the reign of Jeroboam II. His second section ends with the third verse of chapter VI; and contains the prophecies delivered in the interval between the death of Jeroboam and the death of Pekahiah. His third section ends with the tenth verse of chapter VII; and contains the prophecies delivered during the reign of Pekah. His fourth section ends with the eighth verse of chapter XIII; and contains the prophecies delivered during the reign of Hoshea. His fifth section comprehends the remainder of the book; “containing,” according to the title which he gives it, “a prophecy of the restoration of Israel (together with those of Judah, under the common name of Jews), after the Assyrian and Babylonian captivity; as also, and chiefly, the restoration of all the said tribes, or Jews, into their own country, after their captivity, and long dispersion by the Romans, viz. on the general conversion of all the Jews to Christianity, at the approach, or commencement, of the happy and triumphant state of the Church, which shall yet be on earth.” — Certainly this last section is composed of dreadfull comminations and glorious promises wonderfully intermixed. But the promises have no clear reference to any restoration, previous to the final restoration of the whole race from their present dispersed state. In the preceding sections, the prophecies correspond so imperfectly with the times, to which they are severally referred, that the truth seems to be, as it is stated by Bishop Lowth, “modicūm habemus volumen, vaticinationes Hoseæ, ut videtur præcipuas continens, easque omnes inter se sine ullis temporum notis, aut argumenti distinctione, connexas.” — Insomuch, that it must be a vain attempt to distinguish, what the author has left without mark of distinction. I agree not, however, in the consequence drawn by that illustrious critic, that the want of these distinctions is

is the cause of the obscurity we find in Hosea's writings : “ *ita mi-*
 “ *nime mirum est, si Hofeum perlegentes nonnunquam videamur in*
 “ *sparsa quædam Sibyllæ folia incidere.*” The argument or subject
 is one, from the beginning of the book to the end : and obscurity
 cannot arise from the want of distinction, in that respect, in which
 the thing is incapable of distinction. And the subject of these pro-
 phecies being what it is, the chronology of the several distinct ef-
 fusions can be of no consequence to the interpretation : the obscu-
 rity therefore arises from some other causes.

It arises solely from the stile. And the obscurity of the stile can-
 not be imputed to the great antiquity of the composition (in which
 I again reluctantly disagree with that learned writer, whose abilities
 I revere, and whose memory I cherish with affection and regard),
 nor to any thing peculiar to the language of the author's age. In
 the Hebrew language, as in the Greek, the earliest writers extant
 are beyond comparison the most perspicuous ; Homer, Hesiod, and
 Herodotus, among the Greeks ; Moses and Samuel among the He-
 brews. Nor, in all the poetical parts of holy writ, is there any
 thing to surpass, in simplicity of language, those noble monuments
 of the earliest inspired song, which are preserved in the pentateuch :
 the last words of Jacob, the Song of Moses, his last words, the
 Song of Miriam, and the effusions of Balaam. Whatever obscurity
 we find in these most antient compositions, arises not from any ar-
 chaisms of the stile, or from any thing of studied and affected singu-
 larity in the texture of it, but from the subject matter ; and from the
 profound mysticism, which sometimes prevails in the prophetic ima-
 gery. If the book of Job be of an earlier age than any of these (except
 perhaps the last words of Jacob), still its obscurities are not from archa-
 isms, but from dialectic idioms of the author's country. Then, for the
 age of Hosea, it was the age of Isaiah and Micah ; writers in a highly
 adorned but flowing easy stile. Whatever obscurity therefore we find
 in the writings of Hosea, must be confessed to be his own, not ar-
 sing from any peculiar idioms of antiquity, or of his own age.

Stile, but not ar-
 chaism, the cause
 of the obscurity
 of Hosea's writ-
 ings.

P R E F A C E.

The general character of this style.

He delights in a stile, which always becomes obscure, when the language of the writer ceases to be a living language. He is commatic, to use St. Jerome's word, more than any other of the Prophets. He writes in short, detached, disjointed sentences; not wrought up into periods, in which the connection of one clause with another, and the dialectic relations, are made manifest to the reader by an artificial collocation; and by those connexive particles which make one discourse of parts, which otherwise appear as a string of independent propositions, which it is left to the reader's discernment to unite. His transitions from reproof to persuasion, from threatening to promise, from terror to hope, and the contrary, are rapid and unexpected. His similes are brief, accumulated, and often introduced without the particle of similitude. Yet these are not the vices, but the perfections of the Holy Prophet's stile: for to these circumstances it owes that eagerness and fiery animation, which are the characteristic excellence of his writings, and are so peculiarly suited to his subject.

His peculiar idioms.

Besides this general character of Hosea's stile, I shall mention in this place two particulars, which are almost peculiar to this Prophet; which I think can create little difficulty, when the reader is previously apprized of them, and taught to refer them, wherever they occur, to the principle on which they really depend; and yet, for want of being well considered, they have much perplexed interpreters, and have been the occasion of much unwarrantable tampering with the text in the way of conjectural emendation.

Frequent change of person.

The first is a certain inconstancy, if I may so call it, in the person of the pronoun, or of the verb. A frequent sudden change from the second person to the third, or the contrary, in speaking, when the people collectively are the principal object of speech. Unaccountable as this has seemed to many expositors, it arises naturally, I apprehend, from the general plan of composition in these prophecies: which

which are all conceived in the shape of a discourse, held in public between Jehovah and the Prophet, upon the subject of the guilt, the punishment, and the final pardon of the people. Even in those prophecies, which open with a call upon the children of Israel, or upon the priests in particular and the house of the king, to give ear ; still the Prophet is the person, with whom Jehovah principally talks. To him he sets forth the crimes of the people ; to him he denounces the impending judgements ; and to him he opens his merciful intention of restoring the converted race of Israel to his favour in the latter days. But in these discourses Jehovah often turns, in the fire of indignation, from the Prophet directly upon the people themselves ; addressing them in the second person, of whom he had been speaking in the third (as in chap. iv. 5). Sometimes the same turn of the discourse is made, in the tenderness of love, or exuberance of pity (chap. ii. 18. 19. &c. xi. 7. 8). Sometimes, on the contrary, Jehovah, speaking to the people, turns suddenly away from them, in contempt as it were of their unworthiness, to his friend and confidant, if we may so venture to speak, the Prophet (chap. viii. 5). The instances of these changes of the speech are innumerable ; and sometimes so sudden, that the same sentence, which begins in the third person, shall end in the second ; or, beginning in the second, it shall end in the third. But this is so far from an obscurity, when it is traced to its true principle, that, by removing it, the whole animation of the discourse would be extinguished. I have in most places retained this peculiarity in my translation, and, I flatter myself, without obscurity. In some few instances indeed, but in very few, I have been compelled, for the sake of perspicuity, to abandon it.

The second circumstance in Hosea's stile, which has much embarrassed his interpreters, is his frequent use of the Nominative Absolute. By the nominative absolute I mean a noun substantive, a proper name or an appellative, in the nominative case, placed at the beginning of a sentence, without any grammatical connection with any other

Nominative ab-
solute.

word; and serving only to announce, by its name, the principal subject of the proposition, which is immediately to follow, and to awaken attention to it. See chap. ix. 8 and 11. The difficulty is considerably increased, when the nominative is not expressly mentioned, in what immediately follows, as the subject of the discourse, though it is really what is uppermost in the speaker's mind. See chap. xiv. 8. This nominative absolute occurs in the Psalms, and in most of the Prophets. It is a figure of vehement impassioned speech; and it is frequent in Hosea, because his style, above all the other Prophets, is vehement and impassioned. The noun so used is easily distinguished, in our language, by a note of admiration placed after it. And it is the want of that mark, that has made this figure a cause of obscurity in the original Hebrew text.

Anomalies of
number and
gender.

The obscurities arising from what is called an anomaly either of the number, when a collective noun, singular in form and plural in sense; or a noun, plural in form and singular in sense, is connected indifferently with singular or plural verbs, pronouns, and adjectives; or, an anomaly of the gender, when a noun, rendering what has naturally no sex, is connected almost indifferently with masculine and feminine, and with both in the same sentence; and that other anomaly of the gender, when one and the same word, taken as the name of a people, may be masculine, and as the name of the country which the people inhabit, feminine; and that too in the same sentence: these are not peculiar to Hosea, and are too inconsiderable to deserve more, than the bare mention that they are frequent.

Ambiguity of
the pronouns.

An obscurity, arising from an indistinctness in the reference of the pronoun of the third person, will appear to the English reader to prevail remarkably in Hosea. But this is not to be imputed to the Prophet, nor indeed to any of the sacred writers; in all of whom it is found in the English Bible, but is introduced, often indeed unavoidably

avoidably, by translation; and it arises from a circumstance, in which the idiom of our language differs from the Hebrew, and from all the antient languages. The English language admits, in some particular cases only, a subintelle^ction of the pronoun as the nominative case to the verb; which, in the antient languages, is oftener understood than expressed. And this often lays the English translator under an inevitable necessity of introducing the pronoun of the third person as the nominative case, when it is also the accusative after the verb; and, before and after the verb, necessarily rehearses different persons.

— and THEY bare children to THEM.” Gen. vi. 4. “ They,” the daughters of men, bear “ to them;”—to them, the sons of God. Here, indeed, the ambiguity is introduced in the English by a mis-translation. The verb **דָּלַד** signifies either “ to bear” or “ to beget.” And the nominative case of the masculine verb **דָּלַד**, in the original, is “ the sons of God.” And the proper rendering would be thus: “ — the sons of God came in unto the daughters of “ men, and begat to themselves children.” And this is the rendering of the Alexandrine LXX, and the old version of Tyndal, and of the Bishop’s Bible: — *εἰσεπορεύοντο οἱ ἄρρενες τε θεοὶ πρὸς τὰς θυγατέρας τῶν αὐθεόπων. καὶ ἐγεννῶσαν ἐαυτοῖς.* LXX. “ — the chyldren of God had lyen with “ the daughters of men, and had begotten them chyldren.” Tyndal. Again, “ — in the likeness of God made HE HIM.” Gen. v. 1. He, God, made him man. Here again the translation has introduced the ambiguity; which is not in the original, and was avoided in the old translation of Tyndal, by a better arrangement of the words, “ — when God created man, and made hym after the similitude “ of God.” The ambiguity, however, in the English language is often unavoidable; as in Hosea, chap. xii. 4. 5: “ — HE had “ wept, and made supplication unto HIM. At Bethel HE found “ HIM, and there he spake with us;” i.e. He [Jacob] had wept, and made supplication unto him [the Angel]. At Bethel he [Jacob] found him [the Angel], and there he [the Angel] spake with us.

The.

The insertion of the nominative *He*, in the English translation, is unavoidable ; and produces the ambiguity, which is not in the original.

The causes of Hosea's obscurity, or reputed obscurity, to speak with more justice of his writings, I take to be those, which I have enumerated. The general commatism of his stile ; his frequent and sudden transitions ; the brevity and accumulation of his similes, and those two remarkable circumstances, his inconstancy in the person of the verb, and the use of the nominative absolute.

Supposed obscurity, from corrupt readings, not to be removed by conjectural emendations.

But Archbishop Newcome maintains that the “greatest difficulties arise from the corrupt readings, which deform the printed text.” Much as I have been indebted, in the prosecution of this work, to the previous labours of that learned Prelate, against this opinion I must openly and earnestly protest. It is an erroneous opinion, pregnant with the most mischievous consequences ; and the more dangerous, as having received the sanction of his great authority. That the sacred text has undergone corruptions, is indisputable. The thing is evident from the varieties of the MSS, the ancient versions, and the oldest printed editions : for, among different readings, one only can be right ; and it is probable, I go farther, I say that it is almost certain, that the worse reading has sometimes found its way into the printed text. That the corruptions are greater in Hosea, than in other parts of the Old Testament, I see no reason to suppose. That the corruptions in any part are so numerous, or in such degree, as to be a principal cause of obscurity, or, indeed, to be a cause of obscurity at all, with the utmost confidence I deny. And, be the corruptions what they may, I must protest against the ill-advised measure, as to me it seems, however countenanced by great examples, of attempting to remove any obscurity supposed to arise from them, by what is called conjectural emendation. Considering the matter only as a problem in the doctrine of chances,

the

the odds are always infinitely against conjecture. For one instance in which conjecture may restore the original reading, in one thousand, or more, it will only leave corruption worse corrupted. It is the infirmity of the human mind, to revolt from one extreme of folly to the contrary. It is therefore little to be wondered, that, when the learned first emancipated their minds from an implicit belief, which had so long obtained, in the immaculate integrity of the printed text, an unwarrantable licence of conjectural alteration should succeed to that despicable superstition. Upon this principle, great allowance is to be made, first for Cappellus, after him for Hare and Houbigant, and for others since, men of learning and piety, by whose labours the church of God has been greatly edified ; if, in clearing away difficulties by altering the reading, they have sometimes proceeded with less scruple in the business, than the very serious nature of it should have raised in their minds. But their example is to be followed with the greatest fear and caution. I must observe, however, that, under the name of conjecture, I condemn not altogether alterations, which, without the authority of a single MS, are suggested by the antient versions, especially by the Vulgate, Syriac, or Septuagint. The consent indeed of those versions, in one reading, wherever it is found, I esteem a considerable, though not always an indisputable authority for an emendation.

What authority may, consistently with the rules of sober criticism, be allowed to the antient versions in general, or to any one of them in particular, for the establishment of various readings ; are questions of great moment, which well deserve a deep consideration. Perhaps the error of late years has been to set this sort of authority much too high. “ *Lectiones versionum, quæ superstitionem codicum habent præsidium* (says De Rossi with great judgement) *multi faciendæ sunt, censendæque generatim ex exemplari depromptæ, quod interpres habebat ob oculos. Contra, quæ MSS fide destituuntur, dubiæ sunt, infirmæque per se auctoritatis ; quum dubii simus, num*

Authority of the
versions to es-
tablish various
readings.

“ *ex*

“ ex archetypo codice eas hauserit interpres, an vero arbitrio induit-
“ ferit; ipsumque codicum silentium posterius videtur arguere, nisi
“ gravis conjectura critica aliter suadeat, historiæque analogia ac
“ veritas. Cautè itaque colligendæ veterum interpretum lectiones—
“ cautius vero præferendæ.” With respect to the Greek version of
the LXX in particular, it may reasonably be made a doubt, whe-
ther the MSS, from which it was made, were they now extant,
would be entitled to the same degree of credit as our modern He-
brew text, notwithstanding their comparatively high antiquity.
There is certainly much reason to believe, that, after the destruction
of the Temple by Nebuchadnezzar, perhaps from a somewhat earlier
period, the Hebrew text was in a much worse state of corruption,
in the copies which were in private hands, than it has ever been
since the revision of the sacred books by Ezra. These inaccurate
copies would be multiplied during the whole period of the captivity,
and widely scattered in Assyria, Persia, and Egypt; in short, through
all the regions of the dispersion. The text, as revised by Ezra, was
certainly of much higher credit, than any of these copies, notwith-
standing their greater antiquity. His edition succeeded, as it were,
to the prerogatives of an autograph (the autographs of the inspired
writers themselves being totally lost), and was henceforward to be
considered as the only source of authentic texts: insomuch, that the
comparative merit of any text now extant will depend upon the pro-
bable degree of its approximation to, or distance from, the Esdrine
edition. Now, if the translation of the LXX was made from some of those
old MSS, which the dispersed Jews had carried into Egypt, or from
any other of those unauthenticated copies; which is the prevailing
tradition among the Jews, and is very probable; at least it cannot
be confuted: it will be likely, that the faultiest MS, now extant,
differs less from the genuine Esdrine text, than those more ancient,
which the version of the LXX represents. But much as this con-
sideration lowers the credit of the LXX, separately, for any various
reading,

reading, it adds great weight to the consent of the LXX with later versions, and greater still to the consent of the old versions with MSS of the Hebrew, which still survive. And as it is certainly possible, that a true reading may have been preserved in one solitary MS; it will follow, that a true reading may be preserved in one version: for the MS, which contained the true reading at the time when the version was made, may have perished since; so that no evidence of the reading shall now remain, but the version. I admit, therefore, that, in some cases, which however will be very rare, the authority of any antient version (but more especially that of the Syriac) may confirm a various reading, supported by other circumstances, even without the consent of any one Hebrew MS now extant. Provided only, that the emendation be not made without a reasonable certainty, after due consideration, that the sense of the version, which suggests the alteration of the reading, is not to be derived from the text as it stands: the reverse of which I take to be the case in many instances of various readings, which have been proposed upon the imagined authority of some one or more of the antient versions. But a difference between any of the antient and our modern version, is no indication of different readings in the MSS used by the different translators; unless the text, as it now stands, be clearly incapable of the sense given in the antient version: in which case the conclusion of a variety in the reading of the original, or of a corruption in the version, is inevitable. It must be observed, however, that this authority of the antient versions is to be considered both ways. The agreement of any of them, in the sense of any passage, with the modern, being a more certain evidence of the agreement of the MSS, from which that antient translation was made, with the text as it now stands; than the disagreement in sense, when it is not to be reconciled with the present text, is an evidence of a various reading of the text in the older MSS. I say, a more certain evidence; because, from the disagreement of any antient version with the present text, the utmost, we can conclude, is the alternative. Either the author of that an-

tient version had a different reading of the Hebrew, or the text of the version itself is corrupted ; or, perhaps, the antient interpreter has mistaken the sense of the original. But the conjectural emendation, which I chiefly dread and reprobate, is that which rests solely, on what the critics call the “ exigence of the place.” For a supposed exigence of the place, in the text of an inspired writer, when it consists merely in the difficulty of the passage as we read it, may be nothing more, than the imperfect apprehension of the uninspired critic. With respect to the division indeed of sentences and words, an entire freedom of conjecture may be allowed ; in taking words, or letters, which, as the text is printed, terminate one sentence, or one word, as the beginning of the next: or the contrary. Because these divisions, in the antient languages, are not from the author, but have been supplied by scribes and editors of a late age : and his critical judgement must be weak indeed, who, in such matters, is not qualified to revise and reverse the decisions of the wise men of Tiberias. Numerals may sometimes be corrected by conjecture ; to make dates agree one with another, or a sum total agree with the articles of which it is composed. But this is not to be done without the greatest circumspection, and upon the evidence of calculations formed upon historical data, of which we are certain. A transposition of words may sometimes be allowed ; and all liberties may be taken with the points. Beyond this conjecture is not to be trusted, lest it make only a farther corruption of what it pretends to correct. At the utmost, a conjectural reading should be offered only in a note (and that but rarely), and the textual translation should never be made to conform to it. It is much safer to say, “ This passage it is beyond my ability to explain ;” than to say, “ The Holy Prophet never wrote what I cannot understand ; I understand not the words, as they are redde—I understand the words thus altered ; therefore, the words thus altered are what the Holy Prophet wrote.”

I must

I must observe, that the great similarity between some of the letters of the Hebrew alphabet, in particular between א and ב ; נ and נ ; ג and ג ; י and י ; ל , ל , and ל ; which is often alleged in defence of conjectural emendation; though it might be an argument of some weight, in justification of the exercise of that sort of criticism, in the time of Capellus, Hare, or even Houbigant, who all lived before any great number of Hebrew MSS had been collated; is now, by the immortal labours of Kennicott and De Rossi, completely turned the other way. For, if the text has been corrupted, by the error of a scribe confounding similar letters; it might be expected, that, in some of the multitude of copies from the MS in which the error was first committed, the true reading would regain its place, by the same contingency of error, by which it lost it. If a transcriber in the tenth century writes a נ for a נ , and his MS is copied by various transcribers in the eleventh, twelfth, and thirteenth centuries; surely the odds are great, that some of these blunder back again, and restore the נ . And if a conjecturer of the present day, proposing to change a נ into a נ , cannot find a נ , in the place of the נ , in any one of the numerous MSS that have been collated; he ought to give up his conjecture, whatever difficulty he may find in the text as it stands: for the uniformity of the MSS, where the chance of error is equal either way, is hard to be otherwise accounted for, than by the truth of the reading. I have already admitted, that in some cases, though but rarely, the antient versions may establish a reading without a single MS. But a reading that has no support either from version or MSS, now that MSS have been diligently collated, ought to be rejected as indubitably false: unless the case falls within the limits of allowable conjecture, specified above. The work of Dr. Kennicott is certainly one of the greatest, and most important, that have been undertaken, and accomplished, since the revival of letters. But its principal use and importance is this; that it shuts the door for ever against conjecture, except under the restrictions which have been mentioned.

Similarity of
Hebrew letters
no justification
of conjectural
emendation.

P R E F A C E.

Rejected
emendations.

I annex a list of passages in which, in my translation, I follow the printed Hebrew text in preference to Abp. Newcome's emendations; whether his own, or those of others which he has adopted.

	READING OF PRINTED TEXT.	REJECTED EMENDATION.	AUTHOR.
CHAP. I. 9.	אהיו לך	אליהיכם	Houbigant, upon mere conjecture.
CHAP. II. 9.	לבשות	מכסות	Houbigant, from LXX:
CHAP. IV. 4.	ועמד במריבי	עמי כמריבת	Archbishop Newcome, from LXX. Archbishop Newcome, upon the authority of a single MS. — The Syr. according to the Latin interpretation of it in the Polyglot, may seem to favour this reading. But the Latin is wrong. The true rendering of the Syriac is this: “Et populus tuus tanquam cum faceret dote rixans.” The Latin preposition <i>cum</i> is virtually included in the Hithpael-form of the participle נִמְלָאָה . See chap. IV. note (C).
	הבו	omitted	Houbigant, with consent of Secker. Syr. LXX. and three MSS. See chap. IV. note (P).
CHAP. V. 3.	הונית	הונה	Houbigant, upon authority of all the antient versions.
	חדש	החשל	Houbigant, upon the supposed authority of the LXX. See chap. V. note (D).
CHAP. VI. 3.	ירוה	ירוה	Archbishop Secker, upon the authority of Syr. and Chald.
	משפטיך אור	משפטיך באור	Archbishop Newcome, upon the authority of Syr. and Chald. See chap. VI. note (F).
CHAP. VII. 1.	ברפאי	ברפאי	Archbishop Newcome, upon the single authority of the printed Bible of Brescia 1494.
	ללבגס	בללבגס	Archbishop Newcome, upon the authority of the Complutensian Bible, and some MSS. See chap. VII. note (D).

P R E F A C E.

xi

	READING OF PRINTED TEXT.	REJECTED EMENDATION.	AUTHOR.
CHAP. VII.	6. אֲפָהָם	אֲפָרִים	Archbishop Newcome, upon the authority of one MS. and the version of the LXX.
	14. יְתָנוּרָרוּ	יְתָנוּדָרוּ	Michaelis. The authority of one MS, and one edition only is alleged, and the version of the LXX. Another edition, and six or seven other MSS, might have been produced from De Rossi. But there is no sufficient reason to disturb the printed text.
	16. לֹא עַל	לֹא יוּעַל	Archbishop Newcome, upon mere conjecture.
CHAP. VIII.	5. 6. נְקִזּוֹ : כִּי מִשְׁרָאֵל :	נְקִזּוֹ or נְקִזּוֹ בִּשְׁרָאֵל :	Archbishop Newcome, upon authority of LXX.
	6. וְהָוָא	הָוָא	Houbigant, alleging the Syriac. But if an alteration were to be made upon the authority of the Syriac, it would be to omit the whole word וְהָוָא. One MS. only of Kennicott's omits the ו, and originally one other of De Rossi's.
CHAP. IX.	13. בְּנֹה	בְּנָאוּה	Archbishop Newcome, upon the authority of the Vulg. and the supposed authority of Chald.
CHAP. X.	5. גִּילּוֹ	יְחִילּוֹ	Calmet, upon mere conjecture, without any authority, and without any <i>exigentia loci</i> .
	10. בָּאוֹתִי	בָּאתִי	Houbigant, upon mere conjecture, without authority, and without necessity.
	— בָּאָסָרֶת	בָּהָסָרֶם or בָּיָסָרֶם	Archbishop Newcome, upon the supposed authority of LXX. Vulg. and Syr.
	11. עֲבָרָתִי	הָעֲבָרָתִי	Archbishop Newcome, upon mere conjecture, without any authority, and much for the worse.
	— טָוב	מוֹט	Houbigant, upon mere conjecture.
—	ארכִיב	יַדְרֵךְ	Archbishop Newcome, upon mere conjecture.
12.	כְּפִי	לְפִרְט	Archbishop Newcome, upon the supposed authority of LXX.
—	וִזְתָּה	דָּעַת	Archbishop Newcome, upon authority of LXX.
14.	שְׁלָמָן	צְלָמָנוּ	Grotius. See chap. X. note (S).

P R E F A C E.

	READING OF PRINTED TEXT.	REJECTED EMENDATION.	AUTHOR.
CHAP. X.			
14.	בֵּית אַרְבָּאֵל	בֵּית יְרֵבָעֵל	Grotius, with some countenance perhaps from Vulg. and the Alex. LXX. See chap. X. note (S).
15.	בֵּית אַל	בֵּית יִשְׂרָאֵל	Houbigant, upon authority of LXX. See chap. X. note (S).
—	מִפְנֵי רַעֲתֶיכֶם	מִפְנֵי רַעֲתֶיכֶם	Archbishop Newcome; thus expunging from the text a frequent and most emphatic Hebraism, confirmed by Vulg. Syr. and LXX. except indeed the reading of the Aldine MS. and text be admitted.
CHAP. XI.			
2.	קָרָא	בָּקָרָא	Houbigant, upon supposed authority of LXX. and Syr.
3.	וּרְועֵתָיו	וּבָרְועֵתָיו בָּרְועֵתָיו	Archbishop Newcome, upon the alleged authority of the versions, the latter Prophets of Soncinum, and one MS. of Kennicott's originally; Abn Walid and R. Tanchum; to which may be added, for the omission of the suffix ל , three MSS. of De Rossi's originally. But the introduction of the prefix בְּ is entirely his own, without any authority at all. I should think by mistake; the learned Primate having overlooked the preposition עַל .
4.	כְּמַרְיָמִי	כְּמַרְיִם	Archbishop Newcome, upon authority of the versions, and one MS. of Kennicott's originally.
—	אָכֵיל	אָכְלָו or אָכְלָל	Archbishop Newcome, upon the supposed authority of the LXX.
5.	לֹא	omitted.	Archbishop Newcome, upon authority of LXX.
12.	רֹר	רֹד	Archbishop Newcome, upon authority of Vulg. and perhaps Syr.
—	נָאָכֵן	תָּאָמֵן	Archbishop Newcome, upon authority of Vulg.
CHAP. XII.			
4.	בְּכָה	בְּכָה	Houbigant, upon mere conjecture.
—	עַמְנוּ	עַמּוּ	Houbigant, upon supposed authority of Syr.
8.	גִּיעֵז	גִּיעֵז or גִּיעֵזָוּ	Archbishop Newcome, upon authority of LXX.
—	לֹ	לֹ	Archbishop Newcome, upon authority of LXX.
9.		הַמְּעַלְּהָן inserted	Archbishop Newcome, upon supposed authority of LXX. and Syr.

	READING OF PRINTED TEXT.	REJECTED EMENDATION.	AUTHOR.
CHAP. XIII.			
4.		המעלך. inserted	Archbishop Newcome, upon the authority of two MSS. with the supposed authority of the versions.
6.	כמרעיהם	במרעיהם	Houbigant, mere conjecture, and to the great detriment of the meaning.
9.	שחחך	שחחין	Houbigant, upon the supposed authority of the Syr.
	בי	כוי	Houbigant, upon supposed authority of Syr. and LXX.
13.	עת	עתה	Houbigant. Archbishop Newcome cites the Syr. and Ald. LXX.
14.	אהי	אייה	Houbigant, upon the supposed authority of the versions, and the supposed authority of St. Paul. See chap. XIII. note (O).
	אהי	אייה	
CHAP. XIV.			
2.	פרים שפטינו	פרי משפטינו or פרי שפטינו	Le Clerc, mere conjecture.
6.	בלבנו	בלבנה	Archbishop Newcome, upon authority of LXX. and Syr. See chap. XIV. note (C).
8.	לו	לו	Archbishop Secker, upon authority of LXX.

In addition to these fifty-one instances², in which I reject the proposed alteration of particular passages, as unnecessary in every one, and, in many, much for the worse; the metrical arrangement, attempted by the learned Primate, may be considered as one vast conjectural emendation, affecting the whole text of the Prophet, in the form, though not in the substance,

² It may strike the learned reader, if he takes the trouble to compare the foregoing table, with another which he will find in the 186th page of the ensuing volume, that in two, but in two only, of the fifty-one passages in which I reject Archbishop Newcome's emendations, namely, in chap. vi. 3. and viii. 5. I have ventured to make emendations of my own. But these emendations of mine he will find to be confirmed by a great consent of the oldest printed editions and best MSS;

which

Metrical ar-
rangement of
Hosea's compo-
sition irreco-
verably lost.

which I have not ventured to adopt. The stile of Hosea is indeed poetical in the very highest degree. In maxim solemn, sententious, brief: in perswasion, pathetic; in reproof, severe; in its allusions, always beautifull and striking, often sublime: rich in its images; bold in hyperbole; artificial, though perspicuous, in its allegory: possessing in short, according to the variety of the matter, all the characters by which poetry, in any language, is distinguished from prose. And there cannot be a doubt, that the composition was originally in the metrical form. But as the division of the hemistichs is not preserved in the MSS, nor in any of the versions; I consider the metrical form as lost. And as the greatest adepts, in the mysteries of the Masoretic punctuation, have never discovered in this book (or, as far as I know, in any of the Prophets) those peculiarities of accentuation, which are remarkable in the books confessedly retaining the metrical form; I suspect that it was lost early, not only in Hosea, but in all the Prophets (Isaiah perhaps excepted) and the attempt to restore it is too much, in my judgement, for modern criticism; especially as the parallelism (the only circumstance the modern critic has to guide him in the construction of the distichs), is, in many parts of the book, if not indeed in the greater part of it, exceedingly imperfect, interrupted and obscure: an effect perhaps of the commatism of the stile. If in certain passages the parallelism is entire, manifest, and striking (as in some it certainly is, insomuch that some of Bishop Lowth's choicest examples, of this great principle of Hebrew verse, are taken from this Prophet), I trust that my translation is so close, as in those parts to display the structure of the original, though the hemistichal division is not exhibited to the eye in the printed page: and that, notwithstanding this defect, if a defect it be, as much of the versification, if it may be so called, is preserved, as is with certainty discernible to the Biblical scholar in the Hebrew text, in its present state.

With

Design of the
present work.

With respect to my translation, I desire that it may be distinctly understood, that I give it not, as one that ought to supersede the use of the Public Translation in the service of the Church. Had my intention been to give an amended translation for public use; I should have conducted my work upon a very different plan, and observed rules in the execution of it, to which I have not confined myself. This work is intended for the edification of the Christian reader in his closet. The translation is such as, with the notes, may form a perpetual comment on the text of the Holy Prophet. For a translation, accompanied with notes, I take to be the best perpetual comment upon any text in a dead language. My great object therefore in translating has been, to find such words and phrases, as might convey neither more nor less than the exact sense of the original (I speak here of the exact sense of the words, not of the application of the prophecy). For this purpose I have been obliged, in some few instances, to be paraphrastic. But this has only been, when a single word, in the Hebrew, expresses more, than can be rendered by any single word in the English, according to the established usage of the language. A translator, who, in such cases, will confine himself to give word for word, attempts in truth what cannot be done; and will give either a very obscure, or a very defective translation. That is, he will leave something untranslated. The necessity of paraphrastic translation will particularly occur, wherever the sense of the original turns upon a paronomasia: a figure frequent in all the Prophets, but in the use of which Hosea, beyond any other of them, delights. With the same view of presenting the sense of my author in language perspicuous to the English reader, for Hebrew phrases I have sometimes judged it expedient to put equivalent phrases of our own tongue (where such could be found) rather than to render the Hebrew word for word. But these liberties I have never used, without apprising the learned reader of it in my Critical Notes, and assigning

University College Library

ing the reason. And sometimes, in the case of phrases, I have given the English reader a literal translation of the Hebrew phrase in the explanatory notes. In some instances, but in very few, I have changed words, and forms of expression, in frequent use in our public translation, for others, equivalent in sense, of a more modern phraseology: ever keeping my great point in view, to be perspicuous to the generality of readers. The dignity, resulting from Archaisms, is not to be too readily given up. But perspicuity is a consideration, to which every thing must be sacrificed. And if the phraseology of the Bible were not changed, from time to time, to keep pace, in some degree, with the gradual changes of common speech; it would become unintelligible to the common people. With respect to them at this day, the Holy Bible, translated into the English of Chaucer's age, would be a translation out of one dead language into another. Not to say that Archaisms, too long retained, instead of raising the stile, become in the end mean, and even ludicrous. The Book of Psalms would be of little use to the vulgar, if it were translated into the vulgar tongue, after the manner of this specimen: “Why gnastes the gens, and the peple “thoughte ydil thingis².” Though the text were accompanied with this luminous comment: “The Prophete, snybband hem that “tourmentid crift, faies, *whit the gens* — thoo were the knyttes “of rome that crucified crift. — *gnasted*,” “as bestes with oute “resoun. — *and the peple*, thoo were the Jews, *thoughte vaynte* “*thoughtes, &c.*” And the tragical story of John the Baptist, so admirably related in all its circumstances by the Evangelist, would not be heard with gravity in any congregation at this day, were the narrative to proceed in this language: “When the doughtyr of that “Herodias was in-comyn, and had tombylde and, pleside to Ha-“rowde, and also to the sittande at mete, the kynge says to the

² Ps. ii. 1.

“ wench,

“ wench, &c.” There is a limit therefore to the love of Archaisms, beyond which it should not be indulged. But there is a limit also to innovation, which I hope I have not passed.

The Notes, which accompany my translation, are of two kinds ; of the Notes Explanatory and Critical. The first are intended to open the sense of the text, and point out the application of the prophecy, to the English reader. The latter are disquisitions upon various points of ancient learning, many of them purely philological, to ascertain the true sense of the text, to justify my translation of it, or the application of it that I teach the unlearned reader to make, to the satisfaction of the learned reader. The Explanatory Notes accompany the text, being given at the bottom of the page ; and the reference to these is by the smaller letters. The Critical Notes are placed at the end by themselves ; and the reference to these is by the capitals of the Roman alphabet. It often happens, that I have occasion to give an explanatory and a critical note upon the same passage. In this case, that the text might not be too much crowded with letters of reference ; I have often made the reference to the Critical Note, at the end of the Explanatory. It has sometimes happened, that an Explanatory note has unavoidably run to too great a length, to be placed with convenience at the bottom of the page. In this case it is put at the end, among the Critical. And the unlearned reader is referred to it in this manner. “ For an explanation of this, or, for a further explanation of this, see note (A).” Whereas in the case of reference at the end of an Explanatory note, to one of the Critical, in which the mere English reader is less interested, the reference is simply, “ see note (A).” I would observe, however, that in the Critical Notes, with the exception of such as are purely Philological, the unlearned reader will find much, that may afford him both amusement and instruction. And many even of the Philological may be of use to those, who

who have a general acquaintance with antient literature, though but a superficial knowledge of the Oriental languages.

Although no pains have been spared to ascertain the true sense of the original in the obscurest passages, by consulting the ablest commentators and grammarians, and translations, antient and modern, in all the languages I understand ; and by an analysis, which to many may seem in some instances too strict, of words and phrases of various and doubtfull meaning ; I cannot have the vanity to suppose, that the critical reader will not discover many blemishes and imperfections. Some corrections, which have occurred to myself, in the progress of the work through the press, I have given in a short Appendix ^a.

^a See Appendix, N^o I.

UPON repeated perusals of my translation of *Hosea*, and of my notes ; I find little in either, which I see reason to alter. Nothing indeed with respect to the sense of a single text. In the translation, I have, in this second Edition, in some few places, changed expressions, which seemed to fall rather short in strength or dignity, for others of more force, or more elevated ; some, which seemed harsh, for others more elegant ; and some, which, by too close an adherence to the original, I feared might be obscure to the English reader, for others more conformed to the idiom of our language, but representing the sense with equal fidelity. By this greater freedom of translation I have, in some passages, removed the obscurity arising from an ambiguous reference of the pronoun of the third person ; when it would rehearse both the subject and the object of the same verb. Instead of one of the pronouns I have sometimes put the noun itself, which it would rehearse^a ; or I have omitted the pronoun, either before or after the verb, when the person or thing to be rehearsed by it is evident, notwithstanding the omission^b. Sometimes I have put a plural, instead of a singular pronoun, to rehearse a collective^c. But these liberties have never been taken without the greatest caution ; and in instances, in which the sense is too clear and certain to be affected by them. In two passages I have rendered an active verb governing the pronoun of the third person, as its object, by the verb passive having the same pronoun for its subject^d. And this may always be done, without a possibility of affecting the sense, when the subject of the active verb is the indefinite pronoun of the third person plural understood, corresponding to

^a Ch. VIII. 10. XII. 4.^b Ch. X. 6. XII. 4.^c XI. 5.^d Ch. XI. 2—7.

P R E F A C E.

the French On. The indefinite plural understood I have sometimes expressed by the indefinite singular “One”. Some additions are made to the notes, both the Critical and the Explanatory. These are given in a third number, added to the Appendix; where the learned Reader will find the Reasons assigned of all material alterations, which have been made in the translation, beyond those now specified as respecting the pronoun, and the few which were proposed in the Appendix of the former edition, which are adopted. The grounds and reasons of these were stated in Appendix, N^o I. which is given again without alteration.

With respect to emendations of the printed Hebrew Text, I have neither revoked any, that I proposed in my former edition, nor added to the number; except by an alteration of the stops in one passage: adhering immovably to the principle laid down in my former Preface, that the stops and vowel-points, and little else, are fair objects of conjectural Criticism. They are fair objects of conjecture, because they are no part of the sacred text, but a supplement, added by Critics, of abilities as contemptible as their industry was great, and of so late an age, that the Hebrew Language was as much dead to them, as it is at this day to us. So far however, and no farther, entitled to attention, as they may be supposed to have preserved in their Cypher some relicks of expositions handed down to them, by tradition, from abler interpreters of earlier ages. For this I take to be the true notion of the pointed Hebrew Text; that it is the sacred text, accompanied with a perpetual philological comment, exhibited in Cypher or shorthand, founded upon what the Inventors of the Cypher recollect and understood of a Traditional Exposition, corrupted and disfigured, in many places, by their own bad judgement and bad taste.

H O S E A.

CHAP. I. **T**HE word of JEHOVAH which was [spoken] unto
 I. (A) Hosea, son of Beeri, in the days of Uzziah, Jotham,
 Ahaz, Hezekiah, kings of Judah, and in the days of Jero-
 boam, son of Joash, king of Israel.

2 The beginning of the word of JEHOVAH by (A) Hosea
 was in this manner (B). JEHOVAH said unto (A) Hosea ;
 Go, Take to thee a wife of prostitution, and children of
 promiscuous commerce : for the land is perpetually play-
 ing the wanton (C), forsaking JEHOVAH.

3 So he went and took Gomer, daughter of Diblaim, and
 4 she conceived and bare him a son. And JEHOVAH said
 unto him, " Call his name JEZRAEL [*a seed of God^a*] ; for
 yet a little while, and I will visit the blood of Jezräel^b

^a See Preface.

^b — blood of Jezräel. Heb.—bloods of Jezräel," i. e. blood of the holy seed, the faithfull
 servants of God, shed by the idolatrous princes of Jehu's family in persecution, and the blood of
 children shed in their horrible rites upon the altars of their idols. For further explanation of
 this see (D).

upon the house of Jehu, and I will abolish the kingdom
 5 of the house of Israel. And this shall be in that very day^c,
 when I break the bow of Israel in the valley of Jeziäel^d."

6 And she conceived again, and bare a daughter. And
 [God] said unto him, "Call her name LO-RUHAMAH^e [*Not
 Beloved*]: for I will no more cherish with tenderness^f
 the house of Israel, insomuch as to be perpetually forgiv-
 7 ing them" (F). But the house of Judah with tenderness
 I will cherish; and I will save them by JEHOVAH their God,
 and will not save them by bow, nor by sword, nor by ar-
 mour*, by horses nor by horsemen^g.

* And this shall be in that very day, when I break—" This entire abolition of the kingdom of the ten tribes shall take effect, at the time when I break, &c. See (E.)

^d — when I break the bow of Israel, &c." St. Jerome says; the Israelites were overthrown by the Assyrians in a pitched battle in the plain of Jeziäel. But of any such battle we have no mention in history, sacred or profane. But Tiglath-pileser took several of the principal cities in that plain, in the reign of Pekah. And afterwards, in the reign of Hoshea, Samaria was taken by Shalmanazar after a siege of three years; and this put an end to the kingdom of the ten tribes. 2 Kings, xv. 29, and xvii. 5, 6. And the taking of these cities successively, and at last, of the capital itself, was "a breaking of the bow of Israel," a demolition of the whole military strength of the kingdom, "in the valley of Jeziäel," where all those cities were situated. For the breaking of a bow was a natural image for the overthrow of military strength in general, at a time when the bow and arrow was one of the principal weapons.

Although the valley of Jeziäel is here to be understood literally of the tract of country so named, yet perhaps there is an indirect allusion to the mystical import of the name. This being the finest spot of the whole land of promise; the name, the vale of Jeziäel, describes it as the property of the holy seed, by whom it is at last to be possessed. So that, in the very terms of the denunciation against the kingdom of Israel, an oblique promise is contained of the restoration of the converted Israelites. The Israel which possessed it, in the time of this prophecy, were not the rightfull owners of the soil. It is part of the domain of the Jeziäel, for whom it is reserved.

* — not beloved," a disowned, neglected child, having no part in the affections of the reputed father.

^f — cherish with tenderness," or, "cherish with a parent's tenderness;" for this is the full force of the original word.

* See Appendix, N^o III.

8 And she weaned Lo-ruhamah ; and she conceived, and
 9 bare a son. And [God] said, " Call his name LO-AMMI
 [Not a people of mine], for ye are no people of mine, and
 10 I will not be yours. Nevertheless the number^b of the
 children of Israel shall be as the sand of the Sea, which
 cannot be measured, and cannot be counted ; and it shall
 be, that, in the placeⁱ where it was said unto them, " No
 people of mine are ye," [there] it shall be said unto them,
 11 " Children of the living God." And the children of Ju-

* These expressions are too magnificent to be understood of any thing but the final rescue of the Jews from the power of Antichrist in the latter ages, by the incarnate God destroying the enemy with the brightness of his coming ; of which the destruction of Sennacherib's army in the days of Hezekiah, might be a type, but it was nothing more. It may seem perhaps, that the prophecy points at some deliverance peculiar to the house of Judah, in which the ten tribes will have no share ; such as the overthrow of Sennacherib actually was ; whereas the destruction of Antichrist will be an universal blessing. But, in the different treatment of the house of Judah and the house of Israel, we see the prophecy hitherto remarkably verified. After the excision of the kingdom of the ten tribes, Judah, though occasionally visited with severe judgements, continued however to be cherished with God's Love, till they rejected our Lord. Then Judah became Lo-ammi ; but still continues to be visibly an object of God's Love, preserved as a distinct race for gracious purposes of Mercy. Perhaps in the last ages the converts of the house of Judah will be the principal objects of Antichrist's malice. Their deliverance may be first wrought, and through them the blessing may be extended to their brethren of the ten tribes, and ultimately to the whole world. This order of things the subsequent prophecy seems to point out.

^b — the number of the children of Israel." I think this is to be understood of the mystical Israel ; their numbers, consisting of myriads of converts, both of the natural Israel, and their adopted brethren of the Gentiles, shall be immeasurably great.

ⁱ And it shall be that in the place, &c." That is at Jerusalem, or at least in Judaea, where this prophecy was delivered, and where the execution of the sentence took place. There, in that very place, they, to whom it was said, Ye are no people of mine, shall be called children of the Living God. This must relate to the natural Israel of the house of Judah ; for to them it was said, " Ye are no people of mine." And since they are to be acknowledged again as the children of the Living God, in the same place where this sentence was pronounced and executed ; the prophecy clearly promises their restoration to their own land. See Note G.

dah shall be collected^k, and the children of Israel shall be united, and they shall appoint themselves one head, and come up from the earth^l. For great shall be the day of Jezräel^m.

CHAP. I Speak to (A) your brethren, O AMMI [O *my People*],
II. and to your sisters, O RUHAMAH [O *darling daughter*]^a.
2 Argue with your mother; Argue, that she is no wife of
mine, and [that] I am not her husband. But let her re-
move her paramours from her presence, and her adul-
terers from her embraces^b. Lest I strip her even of her
under garments; and set her up to public view, naked as
the day when she was born (B); and make her like the
waste wilderness^c, and reduce her to the condition of a
4 parched land, and kill her with thirst: and cherish not

^k And the children of Judah shall be collected, &c." When converts of the house of Judah shall have obtained a re-settlement in the Holy Land, then a general conversion shall take place of the race of Judah, and the race of the ten tribes. They shall unite in one confession, and in one polity, under one king, Christ the Saviour.

^l — and come up from the earth." i. e. from all parts of the earth to Jerusalem. Jerusalem being situated upon an eminence, and in the heart of a mountainous region, which rose greatly above the general level of the country to a great distance on all sides; the sacred writers always speak of persons going to Jerusalem, as going up.

^m — great shall be the day of Jezräel." Great and happy shall be the day, when the holy seed of both branches of the natural Israel shall be publickly acknowledged of their God; united under one head, their king Messiah; and restored to the possession of the promised land, and to a situation of high pre-eminence among the kingdoms of the earth. See note (H.)

^a Although the Israelites in the days of Hosea were in general corrupt, and addicted to idolatry,
her

her children with kindness, for they are children of promiscuous commerce.

5 For their mother hath played the wanton; she that conceived them hath caused shame (C). For she saith, I will go after my lovers; givers of my bread and my water, of my wool and my flax, of my oil and my liquor^d. Therefore, behold I hedge* up her ways (D) with thorns, and I fence her in with a stone fence (E), that she shall not find her outlets (F). Though she run after her lovers^e, she shall not overtake them; though she seek them, she shall not find them. Then she will say, I will go and return to my first husband; for it was better with me then, than now. But she would not know that I gave her the corn, and the wine and the oil; and silver I sup-

yet there were among them, in the worst times, some who had not bowed the knee to Baal. These were always Ammi and Ruhamah; God's Own People, and a Darling Daughter. God commissions these faithfull few to admonish the inhabitants of the land in general, of the dreadfull judgements that would be brought upon them by the gross idolatry of the Jewish Church and Nation.

^b Heb. from between her breasts." See Cant. I. 13--

^c Heb. and lay her waste like a wilderness." It may seem harsh to say of a woman, that she shall be laid waste like a wilderness, and reduced to the condition of a parched land. But it is to be observed, that the allegorical style makes an intercommunity of attributes between the type and the thing typified. So that when a woman is the image of a country, or of a church; that may be said of the woman, which, in unfigured speech, might be said of the country, or the church, which she represents. The country might literally be made a waste wilderness, by unfruitfull seasons, by the devastations of war, or of noxious vermin: a church is made a wilderness and a parched land, when the living waters of the spirit are withheld.

^d Milk, Honey, Wine, &c.

^e —— her lovers;" i.e. her idols, which, in her distress, she will supplicate in vain.

* See Appendix, N^o III.

plied

plied to her in abundance, and gold, with which they
 9 provided for Baal. Therefore I take away again my corn
 in its proper time, and my wine in its season, and I carry
 off my wool and my flax [which were] to cover her naked-
 10 ness^f. And this moment I will discover her shame (G) in
 the sight of her lovers, and none shall deliver her out of
 11 my hand. And I will cause all her merriment to cease,
 her festivals, her new moon, and her sabbaths, and all her
 12 public assemblies. And I will lay waste her vineyards and
 her fig-tree orchards (H), of which she faith, these are
 my pay (I), with which my lovers requite me ; but I will
 make them a forest, and the beasts of the field shall devour
 13 them. Thus I will visit upon her the days of the Baalim,

^f I think this 9th verse speaks of calamities already begun, and the 10th describes the progress and increase of them. It appears from all the prophets, and particularly from Amos and Joel, that the beginning of judgement upon the refractory, rebellious people was in unfruitfull seasons, and noxious vermin, producing a failure of the crops, dearth, murrain of the cattle, famine, and pestilential diseases.

" —— sooth her and—speak kindly to her." Speak what shall touch her heart, in her outcast state in the wilderness of the Gentile world, by the proffers of mercy in the Gospel. " For the doctrine of the Gospel," says Luther upon this place, " is the true soothing speech, with which the minds of men are taken. For it terrifies not the soul, like the Law, with severe denunciations of punishment ; but although it reproves sin, it declares that God is ready to pardon sinners for the sake of his son ; and holds forth the sacrifice of the Son of God, that the souls of sinners may be assured, that satisfaction has been made by that to God."

" —— thence." The English word " thence" renders either " from that place," or " from that time," or " in consequence of those things." And the original word is used in all these various senses. No one of these senses would be inapplicable in this place : but the last, or the first as figurative of the last, seems the most significant. God declares, that through the wilderness lies the road to a rich fruitfull country ; i. e. that the calamities of the dispersion, together with the soothing intimations of the Gospel, by bringing the Jewish race to a right mind, will be the

when

when she burnt incense to them, and decked herself with her nasal gem, and with her necklace, and went after her lovers, but Me she forgat, saith JEHOVAH.

14 Nevertheless, behold I will sooth her; and though I make her travel the wilderness, I will speak kindly to her^g. For thence^h I have appointed her vineyards for her, and the vale of tribulationⁱ for a door of hope. And 15 there she shall sing as in the days of her youth, even as in the day when she came up out of the land of Egypt^k. 16 And it shall be in that day, saith JEHOVAH, thou shalt call me HUSBAND^l, and no more shalt thou call me LORD. 17 For I will take the names of those LORDS out of her mouth, that by their name they be no more remem-

means of re-instanting them in that wealth and prosperity, which God has ordained for them in their own land.

ⁱ — tribulation" or consternation, Heb. Achor, alluding to the vale near Jericho, where the Israelites, first setting foot within the Holy Land, were thrown into trouble and consternation by the daring theft of Achan. In memory of which, and of the tragical scene exhibited in that spot in the execution of the sacrilegious peculator and his whole family, the place was called the Vale of Achor, Josh. vii. And this Vale of Achor, though a scene of trouble and distress, was a door of hope to the Israelites under Joshua; for there, immediately after the execution of Achan, God said to Joshua, "Fear not, neither be thou dismayed" (chap. viii. 1.); and promised to support him against Ai, her king and her people. And from this time Joshua drove on his conquests with uninterrupted success. In like manner the tribulations of the Jews, in their present dispersion, shall open to them the door of hope.—and there—" i. e. in the wilderness, and in the vale of tribulation, under those circumstances of present difficulty mixed with cheering hope.

^k See Exod. xv. This perpetual allusion to the Exodus, to the circumstances of the march through the wilderness, and the first entrance into the Holy Land, plainly points the prophecy to a similar deliverance, by the immediate power of God, under that Leader, of whom Moses was the type.

^l Ithi, My Husband, is an appellation of Love; Baali, My Lord, of Subjection and Fear.

“ God hath not given us the spirit of Fear, but of Power and of Love, and of a sound mind.

² Tim. i. 7. See Jer. xxiii. 27. See note (K.) and Appendix N^o III.

bered.

18 bered ^m. And I will make a covenant for them in that day, with the beasts of the field, and with the fowls of the heavens, and with the creeping things of the ground; and bow, and sword, and armour, (L) will I break from off the earth, and I will make them lie down in their 19 beds in security. And I will betroth thee to myself for ever. To myself, I say, I will betroth thee with justiceⁿ, and with righteousnessⁿ and with exuberant 20 kindnessⁿ, and with tender loveⁿ. With faithfullness to myself, I say, I will betroth theeⁿ; and thou shalt know 21 the Jehovah. And it shall be in that day, I will perform my part (N), faith JEHOVAH—I will perform my part upon the Heavens; and they shall perform their part upon the

^m It is in vain to look for a purity of religious worship, answerable to this prophecy, among the Jews returned from the Babylonian captivity. This part of the prophecy, with all the rest, will receive its accomplishment in the converted race in the latter days. It is said, indeed, that, after the return from Babylon, the Jews scrupulously avoided Idolatry, and have continued untainted with it to this day. But generally as this is asserted by all commentators, one after another, it is not true. Among the restored Jews there was indeed no public Idolatry, patronised by the government, as there had been in times before the captivity, particularly in the reign of Ahaz. But from the time of Antiochus Epiphanes to the last moments of the Jewish polity, there was a numerous and powerfull faction, which in every thing affected the Greek manners; and this Hellenising party were Idolaters to a man. The Jews of the present times, as far as we are acquainted with them, seem indeed to be free from the charge of Idolatry, properly so called. But of the present state of the ten tribes we have no certain knowledge; without which we cannot take upon us either to accuse, or to acquit them.

— a covenant.” This covenant with the beasts of the field, the fowls of heaven, and the reptiles of the earth, is the final conversion of the most ignorant and vicious of the Heathen to the true faith. The effect of which must be, that they will all live in peace and friendship with the re-established nation of the Jews.

“ — justice,—righteousness,—exuberant kindness,—tender love,—faithfullness.” These words all have reference to what Christ did and gave for the espousal of the Church, his Bride. See note (M.) and Appendix, N^o. III.

22 Earth ; and the Earth shall perform her part upon the corn, and the wine, and the oil ; and they shall perform 23 their part for the JEZRAEL [*the seed of God*]. And I will sow her [as a seed], for my own self, in the earth^a ; and with tenderness I will cherish her, that had been LO-RU-HAMAH [*the not-beloved*] ; and I will say to LO-AMMI [*to the no-people-of-mine*] AMMI [*my own people*] art thou ; and he shall say, MY GOD !

CHAP. I And JEHOVAH said unto me again, “ Go, love the III. woman^a addicted to wickedness (A), and an adulteress ; after the manner of JEHOVAH’s love for the children of Israel^b, although they look to other Gods, and are addicted to goblets of wine.”

◦ The myriads of the natural Israel, converted by the preaching of the Apostles, were the first seed of the Universal Church. And there is reason to believe, that the restoration of the converted Jews will be the occasion and means of a prodigious influx of new converts from the Gentiles in the latter ages. Rom. xi. 12 and 15. Thus the Jezræl of the Natural Israel from the first have been, and to the last will prove, a seed sown of God for himself in the Earth. See note (O).

◦ — the woman ;” i. e. Gomer the prophet’s wife, discarded for her incontinence after her marriage. In Chap. i. 3, before her marriage, she was only a fornicatress ; but, for her irregularities afterwards, she is now branded with the name of an adulteress. See note (B), and Appendix, N° II.

◦ — children of Israel.” “ Children of Israel,” and “ House of Israel,” are two distinct expressions to be differently understood. “ The house of Israel,” and sometimes “ Israel” by itself, is a particular appellation of the ten tribes, as a distinct kingdom from Judah. But “ the children of Israel,” is a general appellation for the whole race of the Israelites, comprehending both kingdoms. Indeed it was the only general appellation, before the captivity of the ten tribes ; afterwards, the kingdom of Judah only remaining, “ Jews” came into common use as the name of the whole race, which before had been the appropriate name of the kingdom of Judah. It occurs for the first time in the 16th chapter of the Second Book of Kings, in the history of Ahaz. It is true, we read in Hosea of “ the children of Judah and the children of Israel ;” i. 11. But this is only an honourable mention of Judah as the principal tribe, not as a distinct kingdom. And the true

2 So I owned her (B) as my own by fifteen pieces of silver,
 3 and a homer and a half of barley. And I said unto her,
 " Many days shalt thou tarry for me ; thou shalt not play
 the wanton, and thou shalt not have to do with a husband,
 neither will I with thee^c."

4 For many days shall the children of Israel tarry, without
 king, and without ruler^d, and without sacrifice^e, and
 without statue, and without ephod and teraphim^f. After-
 ward shall the children of Israel return, and seek the JE-
 HOVAH their God, and the DAVID their King, and adore
 (D) JEHOVAH, and his goodness, in the latter days.

exposition of the expression is, " the children of Judah, and all the rest of the children of Israel." We find Judah thus particularly mentioned, as a principal part of the people, before the kingdoms were separated. See 2 Sam. xxiv. 1. 1 Kings, iv. 20 and 25. And yet at that time Israel was the general name. 1 Kings, iv. 1.

^c The condition of the woman restrained from licentious courses, owned as a wife, but without restitution of conjugal rites, admirably represents the present state of the Jews, manifestly owned as a peculiar people, withheld from idolatry, but as yet without access to God through the Saviour.

^d — without king and without ruler ;" without a monarch, and without any government of their own.

^e — without sacrifice ;" deprived of the means of offering the typical sacrifices of the law, and having as yet no share in the true sacrifice of Christ.

^f — without statue, ephod, and teraphim." After much consideration of the passage, and of much that has been written upon it by expositors ; I rest in the opinion strenuously maintained by the learned Pocock, in which he agrees with many that went before him, and has the concurrence of many that came after, Luther, Calvin, Vatablus, Drusius, Livelye, Honbigant, and archbishop Newcome, with many others of inferior note ; I rest, I say, after much consideration, in the opinion, that Statue, Ephod, and Teraphim, are mentioned as principal implements of idolatrous rites. And the sum of this 4th verse is this ; that, for many ages, the Jews would not be their own masters ; would be deprived of the exercise of their own religion, in its most essential parts ; not embracing the Christian, they would have no share in the true service ; and yet would be restrained from idolatry, to which their forefathers had been so prone.

Hear

CHAP. I Hear the word of JEHOVAH, ye children of Israel^a ;
IV.

for JEHOVAH hath a controversy with the inhabitants of the land; because there is no truth, nor piety, nor knowledge of God in the land. Cursing and falsehood, and murther and theft, and adultery, know no restraint ^{*}, and blood follows close upon blood^b. Therefore the land shall mourn, and every one dwelling therein shall pine away, even to the beasts of the field, and the fowls of the heavens; yea, the fish of the sea also shall be taken away.

4 By no means (B) let any one expostulate, nor let any one reprove^c; for thy people^d are exactly like those who

It is to be observed, that this fourth verse is the exposition of the type of the prophet's dealing with his wife. If the restriction of the Jews from idolatry is not mentioned, we have nothing in the exposition answering to that article of the typical contract with the woman, "Thou shalt not play the wanton." And certainly the restriction from idolatry is not mentioned, in this fourth verse at all, if it be not represented by tarrying without statue, without ephod, and teraphim. See note (C).

^a See the foregoing chapter, note^b. The prophecy is still general, respecting both branches of the Jewish people.

^{*} —— know no restraint." Heb. —— are burst out." See note A.

^b Murther upon murther.

^c —— Let no one expostulate or reprove; for all expostulation and reproof will be lost upon this people, such is their stubbornness and obstinacy.

^d —— thy people; i. e. thy countrymen, O prophet.

^e —— contend with the priest." To contend with the priest, the authorized interpreter of the law, and the typical intercessor between God and the people, was the highest species of contumacy and disobedience, and by the law was a capital offence. See Deut. xvii. 12. God tells the prophet, that contumacy and perverseness, even in this degree, were become the general character of the people. That the national obstinacy, and contempt of the remonstrances and reproofs of the prophets, were such, as might be compared with the stubbornness of an individual; who, at the peril of his life, would arraign and disobey the judicial decisions of God's priests. See note (C).

5 will contend with the priest^e. Therefore thou^f shalt fall in the day^g, and the prophet also shall fall with thee in the night^h, and I will cut off thy motherⁱ.

6 My people are brought to nothing for lack of knowledge^k. Because thou^l hast scornfully rejected knowledge, I therefore will scornfully reject thee, that thou be no priest to me. In as much as thou hast forgotten the law
7 of thy God, thy children also will I forget. In proportion as they were magnified^m, they have sinned against me.
8 Their glory I will change into infamy. Every one of them, while they eat the sin offerings of my people, sets
9 his own heart upon the crimeⁿ. [Or, every one of them lifts up his soul to the crime.] (G) Therefore it shall be

^e — thou." The last sentence was addressed to the prophet—" thy people, O prophet." This is to the people themselves: "Thou, O stubborn people." This sudden conversion of the speech of the principal speaker, from one to another of the different persons of the scene, is so frequent in the prophets, that it can create no difficulty. See Preface, p. xxx.

^f — in the day;" not for want of light to see thy way; but in the full day-light of divine instruction, thou shalt fall. Even at the rising of that light, which is for the lighting of every man that cometh into the world." In this day-time, when our Lord himself visited them, the Jews made their last false step, and fell.

^g — in the night." In the night of ignorance, which shall close thy day, the prophet shall fall with thee; that is, the order of prophets among thee shall cease.

^h — thy mother;" i. e. thy mother-city, the metropolis. So Capellus, Houbigant, and archbishop Newcome. But Jerusalem is intended, not Samaria. For Samaria was the metropolis of the kingdom of the ten tribes, not of the whole nation, the children of Israel in general. See (D).

ⁱ — knowledge;" i. e. consideration, attention. Because they would not use the means of knowledge which they had. But this lack of knowledge in the people was, in great measure, owing to the want of that constant instruction, which they ought to have received from the priests.

like

like people like priest, and I will visit upon each his ways,
 10 and his own perverse manners to either I will requite. And
 they shall eat, and not be satisfied; wanton, and not pro-
 create: because they have forsaken the JEHOVAH, to de-
 11 vote themselves (H) to dalliance and wine, and the intox-
 icating juice, which take possession of the heart*.

12 My people consult their wood^o!—Let their staff therefore
 give them answers (I). For a spirit of lasciviousness hath
 driven them astray, and they play the wanton, [breaking
 13 loose] from subjection to their God. Upon the tops of
 the mountains they sacrifice, and upon the hills they burn
 incense, under the oak^p and the poplar, and the acorn-
 tree, because the shade thereof is good. Since thus it is,

The lack of knowledge therefore is a general inattention of the people to their religious duty, arising from a want of the admonitions of their constituted teachers. The mention, therefore, of this lack of knowledge occasions a sudden transition from general threatenings to particular denunciations against the priesthood. See note (E).

“—because thou,” &c.—these denunciations are addressed to the High Priest for the time being, as the representative of the whole order.

“—magnified.” The priesthood among the Jews was, by God’s appointment, a situation of the highest rank and authority. The complaint is, that, in proportion as they were raised in dignity and power above the rest of the people, they surpassed the rest in impiety. See (F).

“—the sin offerings, &c.” That is, while they exercise the sacred function of the priesthood, and claim its highest privileges, their own hearts are set upon the prevailing idolatry.

“—consult their wood;” i. e. the images of their idols, made of wood.—“consult,” as oracles, to foretell what is to come to pass, or to advise what measures should be taken.

“—the oak;” i. e. the evergreen oak; or ilex;—“the acorn-tree,” the common oak.

“—separate themselves with harlots;” i. e. they go aside, retire with the women, who prostituted their persons in the precincts of the idolatrous temples. —“themselves;” with respect to the change of person, see note^f.

* See Appendix, N^o. III.

(K) let your daughters play the wanton, and your daughters-in-law commit adultery. I will not visit upon your daughters, when they play the wanton; nor upon your daughters-in-law, when they commit adultery. Because themselves separate themselves^a with harlots, and sacrifice with the women set apart to prostitution^b. Therefore the people, which will not understand, shall fall^c.

15 ^dIf thou play the wanton, O Israel, let not Judah become guilty.—And come ye not unto Gilgal^e, neither go ye up to Bethaven, and swear not “ JEHOVAH liveth^f.”

^a —— set apart to prostitution;” or,—consecrated to prostitution.” The people are charged with partaking in those rites of the idolatrous worship, in which prostitution made a stated part of the religious festivity. The expressions clearly allude to the practice mentioned by Baruch, vi. 43, and minutely described by Herodotus, book i. ch. 199.

^b Here the chapter ought to end.

^c Here a transition is made, with great elegance and animation, from the general subject of the whole people, in both its branches, to the kingdom of the ten tribes in particular. “ Whatever the obstinacy of the house of Israel may be in her corruptions, at least let Judah keep herself pure. Let her not join in the idolatrous worship at Gilgal or Bethaven, or mix idolatry with the profession of the true religion.—As for Israel, I give her up to a reprobate mind.” Then the discourse passes naturally into the detail and amplification of Israel’s guilt.

^d Gilgal, in this period of the Jewish History, appears from Hosea and Amos to have been a scene of the grossest idolatry. “ Come ye not”—i. e. Ye, O Men of Judah. See note^e.

^e —— Swear not, &c.” i. e. Swear not the solemn oath of the living God in an idolatrous temple.

^f —— in a large place,” i. e. in an uninclosed place, a wide common. They shall no longer be fed with care in the rich inclosures of God’s cultivated farm; but be turned out to browse the scanty herbage of the waste. That is, they shall be driven into exile among the Heathen, freed from what they thought the restraints, and of consequence deprived of all the blessings and benefits, of religion. This dreadfull menace is delivered in the form of severe derision: a figure much used by the Prophets, especially by Hosea. Sheep love to feed at large. The sheep of

Truly.

16 Truly Israel is rebellious, like an unruly heifer (L).
 17 Now will JEHOVAH feed them as a lamb in a large place.
 18 A companion (N) of idols is Ephraim.—Leave him to himself. Their strong drink is vapid^y.—Given up to lasciviousness, greedy of gifts^z, (O shame!) (Q) are her
 19 great men. The wind binds her up in its wings^{aa}, and they shall be brought to shame because of their sacrifices.

CHAP. V. 1 Hear ye this, O ye Priests, and hearken ye, O House of Israel, and House of the King give ear, for upon you [proceeds] the sentence; because ye have been a snare upon

Ephraim shall presently have room enough. They shall be scattered over the whole surface of the vast Assyrian Empire, where they will be at liberty to turn very heathen. See (M.) It is remarkable, however, that it is said that, even in this state, Jehovah will feed them. They are still, in their utmost humiliation, an object of his care.

^y —— vapid." Sour, turned. The allusion is to libations made with wine grown dead, or turning sour. The image represents the want of all spirit of piety in their acts of worship, and the unacceptableness of such worship in the sight of God. Which is alledged as a reason for the determination, expressed in the preceding clause, to give Ephraim up to his own ways. "Leave him to himself," says God to his Prophet, " his pretended devotions are all false and hypocritical, I desire none of them." See (O).

^z Heb. They love, Give ye. See Prov. xxx. 15. See (P).

^{aa} An admirable image of the condition of a people torn by a conqueror from their native land, scattered in exile to the four quarters of the world, and living thenceforward without any settled residence of their own, liable to be moved about at the will of arbitrary masters, like a thing tied to the wings of the wind, obliged to go with the wind whichever way it set, but never suffered for a moment to lie still. The image is striking now; but must have been more striking, when a bird with expanded wings, or a huge pair of wings without head or body, was the hieroglyphic of the element of the air, or rather of the general mundane atmosphere, one of the most irresistible of physical agents. —— binds," or, "is binding," the present tense, to denote instant futurity.

Mizpah,

2 Mizpah, a net spread upon Tabor; and the prickers^a have made a deep slaughter. Therefore will I bring chastisement^b upon them all.

3 I have known Ephraim, and Israel hath not been concealed^c from me. At this very moment * thou playest

4 the wanton, O Ephraim; Israel is polluted. Their perverse habits (B) will not permit them to return unto their God; for a spirit of wantonness is within them^d, and the

5 JEHOVAH they have not known. Therefore the excellency of Israel^e shall answer^f to his face, and Israel and

* —— prickers." scouts on horseback, attendants on the chace, whose business it was to scour the country all around, and drive the wild beasts into the toils. The Priests and Rulers are accused as the seducers of the people to apostacy and idolatry; not merely by their own ill example, but with premeditated design; under the image of hunters deliberately spreading their nets and snares upon the mountains. And their agents and emissaries, in this nefarious project, are represented under the image of the prickers in this destructive chace. The toils and nets are whatever, in the external form of idolatry, was calculated to captivate the minds of men; magnificent temples, stately altars, images richly adorned, the gaiety of festivals, the pomp, and in many instances, even the horror of the public rites. All which was supported by the government at a vast expence. The deep slaughter, which the prickers made, is the killing of the souls of men. See (A).

^b —— will I bring chastisement upon ——." Heb. ——will I be chastisement, or, a chastiser, unto ——."

* —— have known —— hath not been concealed," i. e. —— have always known —— hath at no time been concealed." In like manner, at the end of the next verse, —— have not known," is equivalent to —— have never known."

^d —— within them, —— deep in their minds."

^e —— the excellency of Israel," i. e. God. The original word, which the public translation renders "pride," is the same which in Amos viii. 7. is rendered "excellency." And there the "excellency of Jacob" certainly signifies the God of Jacob. See (C.)

^f —— answer." God is considered here, as in many parts of the Prophets, as condescending to a litigation with his people; and the answer here is an answer in the cause argued. The answer on the part of God will be so clear and convincing, that the people of Israel will stand

* See Appendix, N^o. III.

Ephraim shall fall in their iniquity ; with them also shall
 6 Judah fall. With their flocks and their herds they will
 go to seek the JEHOVAH, but they shall not find him^g ;
 7 he hath disengaged himself^h from them. To JEHOVAH
 they have been false. Verily they have begotten a race of
 aliensⁱ. Now shall a month devour them with their
 portions^k.

8 Blow ye the cornet in Gibeah, the trumpet in Rama ;
 found an alarm at Bethaven.—[Look] behind thee, O
 9 Benjamin^l ! Ephraim shall be given up to desolation, in
 the day of [working] conviction in the tribes of Israel *.
 I have declared what shall surely be.

condemned by their own judgement. The answer will prove the justice of God's dealing with them, and their guilt, even to their own conviction.

^g See 2 Chron. xxix. 31—35. xxx. 13—15. 22—24. xxxi. 2—10. 2 Kings xxiii. 21. 22. and 26. 27. 2 Chron. xxxv. 1. 7—9. 18. Also, 2 Chron. xxxiv. 20—28. The prophecy looks forward to the times of Hezekiah and Josiah ; declaring, that the attempts of those pious Kings, to restore the true worship, will fail of any durable effect, and will not avail to reverse the doom pronounced upon the guilty people.

^h —— disengaged himself." Heb. —— loosened himself."

ⁱ —— a race of aliens." Heb. —— children strangers," that is, children trained from their earliest infancy in the habits and principles of idolatry, and growing up aliens with respect to God (for all are not Israel that are of Israel), alienated from Jehovah in their affections ; and in their way of thinking, in their sentiments and practices, mere heathen.

^k Now shall a month devour them with their portions." A very short time shall compleat their destruction. —— with their portions," i. e. their allotments. They shall be totally dispossessed of their country ; and the boundaries of the separate allotments of the several tribes shall be confounded and obliterated, and new partitions of the land into districts shall be made, from time to time, at the pleasure of its successive masters. The captivity of the ten tribes was completed soon after Hezekiah's attempted reformation, and the kingdom of Judah not long survived Josiah's. To these things I think "the month" alludes. See note D.

^l Look behind thee, O Benjamin." This presents the image of an enemy in close pursuit, ready to fall upon the rear of Benjamin.

* See Appendix, N^o III.

10 The rulers (E) of Judah have been as those, that remove the landmarks^m. Upon them, like a flood, I will pour out my fury.

11 Ephraim is hard pressed, ruined in judgementⁿ; because he is self-willed, walking after a commandment^o.

12 Therefore am I as a moth in the garment^p to Ephraim, and as a worm in the flesh^p to the house of Judah (G).

13 When Ephraim perceives his holes^q, and Judah his corrupted sore (I); then Ephraim will betake him to the Assyrian, and ^rfend to the King, who takes up all quarrels^s. But he shall not be able to repair the damage

14 for you^t; nor shall he make a cure of (L) your corrupted

^m That is, they have confounded the distinctions of right and wrong. “They have turned upside down all political order, and all manner of religion.” English Geneva.

ⁿ —— hard pressed, ruined in judgement.” That is, he has no defence to set up against the accusation brought against him; he has nothing to say for himself.

^o —— self-willed, walking after a commandment.” That is, although he has a commandment to walk after, namely the divine law, yet he will take his own way; and this he does, notwithstanding that he pretends to acknowledge the authority of the commandment. The ten tribes pretended to be worshippers of Jehovah; but they worshipped him in the calves at Dan and Bethel; and they appointed a priesthood of their own, in prejudice of the prerogative of the sons of Levi. But see note (F).

^p —— a moth in the garment—a worm in the flesh.” From small and unperceived beginnings, working a flow, but certain and complete destruction.

^q —— holes” eaten by the moth. See (H).

^r I leave a space here, to shew that something is wanting to be the nominative case of the verb “fend.” Perhaps “Judah,” which however is not supplied either by MSS. or versions. But certainly something must have been said about what Judah would do, when he perceived his sore.

^s —— the king who takes up all quarrels.” This describes some powerfull monarch, who took upon him to interfere in all quarrels between inferior powers; to arbitrate between them, and compell them to make up their differences, upon such terms as he thought proper to dictate: whose alliance was of course anxiously courted by weaker states. Such was the

fore.

fore. For, I will be as a lion unto Ephraim; and as a young lion to the house of Judah, I. I will seize the prey, and
 15 begone; I will carry off, and none shall rescue. I will begone, I will return unto my place^u; till what time they acknowledge their guilt, and seek my face. When distress is upon them, they will rise early to seek me^x.

CHAP. I. Come^a, and let us return unto Jehovah. For he hath VI.
 torn, but he will make us whole; he hath inflicted the
 2 wound, but he will apply the bandage. He will bring us to life after two days; the third day he will raise us up, and we shall live in his presence^b, and attain to knowledge.

Assyrian monarch, in the times to which the prophecy relates. His friendship was purchased by Menahem, King of Israel. 2 Kings xv. 19. 20. and in a later period solicited by Ahaz. xvi. 5—9. See (K).

^a See 2 Chron. xxviii. 19—21.

^b —— unto my place.” The image of the lion is pursued, making off to his lair with the prey. The sense is, that Jehovah will withdraw the tokens of his presence from the Jewish temple. The three first verses of the next chapter should be joined to this.

^x —— rise early to seek me.” Dr. Wheeler. Compare Jer. xxxv. 14, 15.

^a Come ——.” The Prophet speaks in his own person to the end of the third verse. He takes occasion, from the intimation of final pardon to the penitent, given in the conclusion of God’s awful denunciation of judgement, to address his countrymen in words of mild pathetic persuasion.

^b —— live in his presence.” Jehovah, who had departed, will return, and again exhibit the signs of his presence among his chosen people. So the Jews, converted and restored, will live in his presence, and attain to the true knowledge of God, which they never had before. The two days and the third day seem to denote three distinct periods of the Jewish people. The first day is the captivity of the ten tribes by the Assyrians, and of the two under the Babylonians, considered as one judgement upon the nation; beginning with the captivity of the ten, and completed in that of the two. The second day is the whole period of the present condition of the Jews, beginning with the dispersion of the nation by the Romans. The third day is the period yet to come, beginning with their restoration at the second advent. R. Tanchum, as he is quoted by Dr. Pocock,

3 Our object of pursuit will be the knowledge of the JEHOVAH. His coming forth is fixed as the morning^e; and he shall come upon us as the pouring shower (B), as the harvest rain, [as] the rain of seed-time [upon] the earth^d.

4 What^e shall I do for thee, O Ephraim? What shall I do for thee, O Judah? Since your piety (D) is as the cloud of the morning; as the dew, which goeth off early. It is, for this that I have belaboured [them] by the prophets (E), killed them by the words of my mouth^f: and the precepts given thee (F) were as the onward-going light^g. For I desired charity (G), not sacrifice; and know-

was not far, I think, from the true meaning of the place. "The Prophet," he says, "points out two times—and those are the first captivity, and a second. After which shall follow a third [time]; Redemption: after which shall be no depression or servitude." And this I take to be the sense of the prophecy, in immediate application to the Jews. Nevertheless, whoever is well acquainted with the allegorical style of prophecy, when he recollects, that our Lord's sufferings were instead of the sufferings and death of sinners; that we are baptized into his death; and, by baptism into his death, are buried with him; and that he, rising on the third day, raised us to the hope of life and immortality; will easily perceive no very obscure, though but an oblique, allusion to our Lord's resurrection on the third day; since every believer may speak of our Lord's death and resurrection, as a common death and resurrection of all believers. See Appendix, N^o III.

^e —— fixed, &c." His appearance is fixed and certain, at its proper season, as the return of the morning. See (A).

^d The images here describe the Jehovah, who is to come forth, as coming in the office of an universal benefactor; the giver of the most general and useful benefits, and as coming forth at a fixed season, and at a season when his appearance will be expected. See note (C).

^e Here Jehovah takes up the discourse again in his own person.

^f —— killed them," frightened them to death with terrible threatenings.

^g —— as the onward-going light." Heb. —— as light which goeth forth," i. e. as light, of which it is the nature and property to *go forth*—to propagate itself infinitely, and in all directions. A most expressive image of the clearness of the practical lessons of the prophets.

^h This is the general rule, comprehending the sum of the practical precepts of the prophets.

7 ledge of God, more than burnt offerings^h. But they, like Adamⁱ, have transgressed the covenant ; even in these circumstances^k they have dealt treacherously against me. 8 Gilead^l is a city of workers of iniquity, marked with foot- 9 steps of blood. And, like banditti lying in wait for the passenger, a company of priests, upon the highway, mur- ther unto Sichem^l. Verily they have wrought lewdness 10 in the house of Israel (L). There have I seen a horrible 11 thing. Fornications in Ephraim ! Israel polluted ! More- over, O Judah, harvest-work^m is appointed for thee, when I bring back the captivity of my people.

ⁱ —— like Adam.” As Adam transgressed a plain command ; so the Israelites transgressed the plainest and the easiest precepts. As Adam’s crime was not to be excused by any necessity or want ; so the Israelites, secure under the protection of Jehovah had they continued faithfull to him, had no excuse in seeking other aids. Adam revolted from God to Satan ; so the Israelites forsook God to worship Devils. Adam broke that one command, on which the justification of himself and his posterity depended ; so the Israelites broke the one precept of charity.

^k —— even in these circumstances.” With all the advantages of the prophetic teaching ; in spite of all admonition and all warning. See (H).

^l If Gilead be put here for Ramoth Gilead (and I know not what other city can be meant, see (I).) it was a city of refuge, Deut. iv. 43 ; and such also was Sichem. Josh. xx. 7. Both therefore inhabited by priests and Levites. By describing the first of these two cities as polluted with blood, and the high-road to the other as beset with knots of priests, like robbers, intent on blood, and murthering on the whole length of the way, up to the very walls of the town ; the Prophet means to represent the priests as seducers of the people to that idolatry, which proved the ruin of the nation. Insomuch, that, like a man who should be murthered in a place of religious retreat, or upon his way to it ; the people, under the influence of such guides, met their destruction in the quarter where, by God’s appointment, they were to seek their safety. See (K.)

^m —— harvest-work. Harvest-work is cut out for Judah at the season of bringing back the captivity. The tribe of Judah is, in some extraordinary way, to be an instrument of the general restoration of the Jewish people. Observe that the vintage is always an image of the season of judgement ; but the harvest, of the in-gathering of the objects of God’s final mercy. I am not aware, that a single unexceptionable instance is to be found, in which the harvest is a type of

When

CHAP. I When (A) I would have healed^a Israel, then the ini-
VII. quity of Ephraim shewed itself openly^b, and the wicked doings of Samaria; for they carried on (B) delusion^c. Therefore a thief is coming; banditti sally forth in
2 the streets^d. And let them not say unto their heart, (D) that I have remembered all their wicked doings^e: even still their perverse habits cling around them, they are be-
3 fore my face. By their evil doings they pleasure the
4 king, and by their perfidies^f the rulers. All of them

judgement. In Rev. xiv. 15, 16, "the sickle is thrust into the ripe harvest, and the earth is reaped;" i. e. the elect are gathered from the four winds of heaven. The wheat of God is gathered into his barn, (Matt. xiii. 30.) After this reaping of the earth, the sickle is applied to the clusters of the vine; and they are cast into the great wine-pres of the wrath of God. Rev. xiv. 18-20. This is judgement. In Joel, iii. 13, the ripe harvest is the harvest of the vine, i. e. the grapes fit for gathering, as appears by the context; see (M). In Jer. li. 33, the act of threshing the corn upon the floor, not the harvest, is the image of judgement. It is true, the burning of the tares in our Saviour's parable, Matt. xiii. is a work of judgement, and of the time of harvest, previous to the binding of the sheaves. But it is an accidental adjunct of the business, not the harvest itself. I believe the harvest is never primarily, and in itself, an image of vengeance.

^a — healed," or "restored." The particular time alluded to is, I think, the reign of the second Jeroboam, when the kingdom of Israel seemed to be recovering from the loss of strength and territory it had sustained, in the preceding reigns, by the encroachments of the Syrians; for Jeroboam "restored the coast of Israel, from the entering of Hamath unto the sea of the plain." 2 Kings, xiv. 25. The successes, vouchsafed to this warlike prince against his enemies, were signs of God's gracious inclination to pardon the people, and restore the kingdom to its former prosperity. "For the Lord saw the affliction of Israel that it was bitter.—And the Lord said that he would not blot out the name of Israel from under heaven; but he saved them by the hand of Jeroboam, the son of Joash." 2 Kings, xiv. 26, 27. But these mercifull purposes of God were put aside by the wickedness of the king and the people. For this same Jeroboam "did that which was evill in the sight of the Lord, he departed not from the sins of Jeroboam the son of Nebat, who made Israel to sin." Ver. 24.

^b — shewed itself openly," literally "was uncovered," or "was bare." i. e. was open, avowed, and undisguised.

are

are adulterers ; like an oven over-heated for the baker ; the stoker (F) desists, after the kneading of the dough, 5 untill the fermentation of it be complete (G)^g. In the day^h of our king (I), the rulers were fevered with wineⁱ ; 6 he stretched out his hand to (K) scorners^k. Truly, in the inmost part of it, their heart is like an oven (L), while they lie in wait ; all the night their baker sleepeth ; in 7 the morning it^l burneth like a blazing fire^m. They are all hot as an oven, and have consumed their judges ; all

^c —— delusion,” literally “ they wrought falsehood,” or “ a lie.” The lie, falsehood, or delusion, was every thing that was seductive in the external rites of the false religions.

^d —— The thief, Pul ; whose peace Menahem bought, with contributions levied upon the people. The banditti, the armies of Tiglath-pileser, over-running Gilead, Galilee, and Napthali. 2 Kings, xv. 19, 20, 29, and 1 Chron. v. 26.

^e Let them not console themselves with the imagination, that in these judgements, to be executed by Pul and Tiglath-pileser, they have suffered punishment in full proportion to their guilt, and have nothing further to dread. They continue unreclaimed. Their evil habits surround them ; they are observed and noticed by me, and will bring down further vengeance. Observe that even the first of these judgements was yet to come, when this prophecy was delivered. But it is usual with all the prophets, looking forward to futurity with full assurance of faith, to speak of it in the present, or even in the past time. See (C).

^f —— their perfidies” towards God, in deserting his service for idolatry. See (E).

^g For the exposition of this text see (H).

^h —— the day of our king,” The king’s birth-day, or perhaps the anniversary of his accession.

ⁱ —— fevered with wine,” Heb. “ were sick with heat from wine.”

^k —— he stretched out his hand to scorners.” Those, who in their cups made a jest of the true religion, and derided the denunciations of God’s prophets, he distinguished, with the most familiar marks of his royal favour ; in this way carrying on the plot of delusion.

^l —— it,” i. e. the oven.

^m As an oven conceals the lighted fire all the night, while the baker takes his rest, and in the morning vomits forth its blazing flame ; so all manner of concupisence is brooding mischief in their hearts, while the ruling faculties of reason and conscience are lulled asleep, and their wicked designs wait only for a fair occasion to break forth.

their kings are fallenⁿ; not one among them hath called unto me.

8 Ephraim! He hath mixed himself with the peoples^o!
 9 Ephraim is a cake not turned^p! Foreigners have devoured his strength^q, and he perceiveth not; grey hairs also are 10 sprinkled upon him^r, and he perceiveth not. And the excellency of Israel answereth to his face^e; but they return not to JEHOVAH their God, nor seek him for all this.
 11 For Ephraim is like a silly dove without sense. They call 12 upon Egypt; they betake them to Affyria^s.—Whithersoever they betake them, I will spread over them my net; as the fowls of the heaven I will bring them down; I will chastise them, as they hear it declared in their congregations^t.

ⁿ — all their kings are fallen." The prophecy looks forward to the fall of the six last Kings in perpetual succession, Zechariah, Shallum, Menahem, Pekahiah, Pekah, Hoshea.

^o — mixed himself with the peoples." By his alliances with the heathen, and by imitation of their manners, he is himself become one of them. He has thrown off all the distinctions, and forfeited the privileges, of the chosen race. See Appendix, N° III.

^p — a cake not turned." One thing on one side, another on the other. Burnt to a coal at bottom; raw dough at the top. An apt image of a character that is all inconsistencies. Such were the ten tribes of the Prophet's day; worshippers of Jehovah in profession; but adopting all the idolatries of the neighbouring nations, in addition to their own semi-idolatry of the calves.

^q Foreigners, &c." His alliances with the Affyrians at one time, with the Syrians at another, at last with the Egyptians, have weakened his strength.

^r — grey-hairs." the symptoms of decay.

^s See v. 5.

^t — betake them to Affyria. Heb. — they go to Affyria." This going to Affyria cannot relate to the captivity of the ten tribes, of which Dr. Wells understands it. It is some voluntary going to Affyria, which is imputed to them as a crime. Indeed, from this passage and many others, it appears that Dr. Wells's third and fourth sections were delivered before the

Woe

13 Woe unto them, for they have wandered away from me. Destruction awaits them, for they have rebelled against me. And I would have redeemed them, but they
14 spoke lies against me. And they cried not unto me in their heart, although they howled upon their beds, and
15 put themselves in a stir about corn and wine (M). They turned against me (N);—then I chastised.—I strengthened their arms;—then they imagined mischief^u against
16 me. They fall back into nothingness of condition^w. They are become like a deceitfull bow. Their rulers shall fall by the sword, for the petulance of their tongues. This shall bring derision upon them in the land of Egypt.

time, to which Dr. Wells refers them. Those of the third, and part of the fourth, not later than the reign of Menahem, and all of them before the reign of Hoshea: though the predictions contained in them extend to the very last period of the kingdom of the ten tribes, and even far beyond it.

^t —— hear it declared in their congregations.” They heard their punishments declared in the prophetical denunciations in the Books of Moses, which were read in their synagogues every Sabbath-day.

^u —— imagined mischief against me.” Formed their plots for the introduction of idolatry, proceeding even to persecution of the prophets and the true worship.

^w The situation of the Israelites, as the chosen people of God, was a high degree; a rank of distinction and pre-eminence among the nations of the earth. By their voluntary defection to idolatry, they debased themselves from this exaltation, and returned to the ordinary level of the heathen; so far above which the mercy of God had raised them. As if a man, ennobled by the favour of his Sovereign, should renounce his honours, and of his own choice mix himself with the lowest dregs of the people. Thus voluntarily descending from their nobility of condition, the Israelites returned to “ Not-High.” For so the Hebrew literally sounds. See (O).

CHAP. I The cornet at thy mouth, [be it] like the eagle over
 VIII. the house of JEHOVAH^a; in as much as they have trans-
 gressed my covenant, and rebelled against my law. [Yet]
 2 they cry unto me, O my God, we acknowledge thee (B).
 3 Israel! He hath cast off, hath Israel, what is good—the
 4 enemy shall pursue him. They have set up kings of
 themselves (C), but not from me. They have appointed
 rulers, whom I knew not^b. Their silver and their gold
 they have wrought for themselves into idols^c, that they
 may be cut off.

5 Thy Calf, O Samaria, hath cast thee off^d. My anger

^a Let the sound of the cornet in thy mouth be shrill and terrifying, as the ominous scream of the eagle hovering over the roof of the temple. See (A) and Appendix, N^o III.

— house of Jehovah.” The house of Jehovah is the temple at Jerusalem. The first four verses therefore of this chapter seem to concern the whole people, and to predict the final dispersion of the people by the Romans. At the 5th verse the prophecy returns to the kingdom of the ten tribes.

^b The only kings of the Israelites, of God’s appointment, were those of the line of David in Judah, and of Jeroboam and Jehu in the kingdom of the ten tribes. But these kings and princes, made without any divine direction, are, I think, rather to be understood of those, who reigned in Judæa after the death of John Hyrcanus, with the usurped title of king, being not of the royal family of David; and of the high priests irregularly constituted, in violation of the right of primogeniture in Aaron’s family, than of the usurpers after Zechariah in the kingdom of Israel. See Appendix, N^o I.

^c Of the idolatry of the Jews, after the return from the Babylonian captivity, See Chap. II. note ^m.

^d Here God himself, who is the speaker, turns short upon Samaria, or the ten tribes, and, in a tone of dreadfull indignation, upbraids their corrupt worship, by taking to himself the title of Samaria’s Calf. I, whom you have so dishonoured, by setting up that contemptible idol, as an adequate symbol of my glory; I, who have so long borne with this corrupt worship, now expressly disown you.

This thing, vile and abominable as it is, was his own invention; not a thing that he had learnt or borrowed from any other nation.

him,” viz. Israel. The first line of this 7th verse predicts generally the dispersion of

burns against them. How long will they bear antipathy
 6 (D) to pure religion (E)? For from Israel came^e even
 this (F): the workman made it, and it is no God. Verily,
 7 the calf of Samaria shall be reduced to atoms (G). Verily,
 a wind shall scatter him^g abroad, a whirlwind shall cut
 him down (H): there shall be no stem belonging to him:
 the ear shall yield no meal; what perchance it may yield,
 8 strangers shall swallow it up. Israel is swallowed up^h:
 They are now among the Gentiles like a vessel in which
 9 no man delightethⁱ. For they are gone up of their own
 accord (I) to Assyria^k. A wild ass all alone for himself^l

the ten tribes, and the demolition of their monarchy by the force of the Assyrian, represented under the image of a scattering wind and destroying whirlwind. The following clauses describe the progressive steps of the calamity, in an inverted order. "There shall be no stem belonging to him." Nothing standing erect and visible in the field; that is, the nation shall be ultimately so utterly extinguished, that it shall not be to be found upon the surface of the earth. But before this utter ruin takes place, it shall be impoverished, and reduced to great weakness. For "the ear," upon the stem yet standing, shall be an ear of empty husks, "yielding no meal." The nation shall not thrive in wealth or power. "And what perchance it may yield, strangers shall consume." Before the extreme decay, represented by the barren ear, takes place; its occasional temporary successes, in its last struggles, will all be for the enrichment and aggrandizement of foreign allies, at last the conquerors of the country.

^h —— swallowed up." Under this image the Hebrew language, the Greek, and our own, describe any sudden destruction so complete, as to leave no visible vestige of the thing remaining.

ⁱ A utensil for the lowest purposes.

^k —— to Assyria." This is not yet the going into captivity. The captivity, though near at hand, is yet to come. This going up is past. It is a voluntary going up, and a crime. The captivity is the punishment.

^l —— all alone for himself." The pronoun "for himself," after "alone," is highly emphatical. It expresses the selfishness, which belongs to an animal savage in such degree, as not only not to be tamed for the service of man, but frequently not disposed to herd with its own kind: without attachment to the female, except in the moment of desire; governed entirely by the œstrum of its own lusts. "Though wild asses be often found in the desert in whole herds, yet

10 is Ephraim. They have given bounties to lovers^m. Notwithstanding that they may give the bounties among the gentiles, forthwith will I embody the men (K); and ere long they shall sorrow, on account of the burthen, the king and (L) the rulers^m.

11 In as much as Ephraim hath multiplied altarsⁿ, altars 12 are (counted) sin unto him (M). I will write upon him 13 SIN's^o. The masters (N) of my law are accounted as it were an alien race^p. The sacrificers of my proper offerings (O) sacrifice flesh, and eat.—JEHOVAH accepteth them not. Forthwith will he remember their iniquity, 14 and visit their sins. They shall return into Egypt^q. For

it is usual for some one of them to break away, and separate himself from his company, and run alone at random by himself: and one so doing is here spoken of." Pocock upon the place.

^m — bounties to lovers." The prophecy alludes not exclusively to the bargain with Pul, but to the general profusion of the government in forming foreign alliances; in which the latter kings both of Israel and Judah were equally culpable; as appears by the history of the collateral reigns of Ahaz and Pekah.—to lovers." Every forbidden alliance with idolaters was a part of the spiritual incontinence of the nation.—given bounties to." The Hebrew word might be more literally rendered "gifted," or "endowed." But to preserve any thing of the spirit of the original, it is necessary to use a word here capable of being applied to military bounties in the next verse. In the next verse God says, that whatever bounties the Israelites might offer, in order to raise armies of foreign auxiliaries; he would embody those armies; he would press the men, paid by their money, into his own service against them.

ⁿ Ere long the king and the rulers will lament the impolitic expence incurred in gifts and presents to their faithless allies, and the burthen of taxes for that purpose laid upon the people.

ⁿ — multiplied altars;" in contempt of the one altar at Jerusalem.

^o I will write upon him SIN's." An allusion to the custom of marking a slave with the owners name. See note (M).

^p — the masters of my law." Those, who pretend to be expounders of my law, shall be disowned as aliens.

^q "To return into Egypt," or, "to go to Affyria," seem to be used as proverbial expressions, capable, according to the application, of the one or the other of two different meanings. Either

Israel

Israel hath forgotten his Maker, and buildeth temples ; and Judah hath multiplied fenced cities : but I will send a fire upon his cities, which shall devour the stately buildings thereof.

CHAP. I Rejoice not, O Israel, like the peoples ^b, with joyous exultation (A) ; for thou hast played the wanton, not cleaving to thy God : thou hast set thy heart upon the fee of prostitution (B). Upon all floors is corn ^c. The floor and the vat shall not feed them ^c, and the must (C) shall deceive their 2 expectations. They shall not dwell in the land of 3 (D) JEHOVAH, for Ephraim is returning into Egypt, and they

to be reduced to an abject oppressed condition, like that of the Egyptian servitude ; which is the sense here : or to fall into the grossest idolatries, such as were practised in Egypt and Assyria ; which is the sense below, chap. ix. verse 3. See Dr. Blaney on Zechariah, v. 11.

^a The prophecy, delivered in this and the next following chapter, seems to regard the kingdom of Israel principally.

^b It should seem that this prophecy was delivered at a time, when the situation of public affairs was promising ; perhaps after some signal success, which had given occasion to public rejoicings.

— like the peoples.” Those national successes, which might be just cause of rejoicing to other people, are none to thee ; for thou liest under the heavy sentence of God’s wrath, for thy disloyalty to him ; and all thy bright prospects will vanish, and terminate in thy destruction. The Gentiles were not guilty in an equal degree with the Israelites ; for, although they sinned, it was not against the light of Revelation, in contempt of the warnings of inspired prophets, or in breach of any express covenant.

^c What the fee of prostitution was, on which they had set their hearts, appears by chap. ii. 12 ; namely abundance of the fruits of the earth ; which they ascribed to the heavenly bodies, and other physical agents, which they worshipped. The prophet here tells them, they might think they had obtained their fee. For their crops were indeed abundant ; nevertheless they would not be the better for the plenty of their land. This might be brought to pass, by the just judgement of God, in various ways ; either the corn not yielding a nutritious meal ; nor the grape a generous juice : or the stomach failing in its office, to extract nutriment from good bread, and wholesome drink ; or the enemy driving them from their land, which thenceforward should produce its abundance for strangers.

4 eat unclean things in Affyria^d. Let them not make libations of wine to JEHOVAH^e, for their sacrifices are not pleasant to him (E): they are to them as the meat of mourners^f, of which all that eat are polluted: their food forsooth be it to themselves (G); let it not come into the house of JEBOVAH.

5 What will ye do for the season of solemn assembly, and
6 for the festival of JEHOVAH? Behold all^g are gone! Total devastation! Egypt shall gather them—Memphis shall bury them^h. Their valuables of silver! The nettle shall dispossess them, and the thistle, in their dwellings (H).

7 The days of visitation are come! The days of retr

^d —— returning into Egypt, and they eat unclean things in Affyria," i. e. they are degenerating in their manners into mere idolaters of the very worst sort.

^e Compare Jer. vi. 20. and Is. i. 11. 13.

^f —— meat of mourners," i. e. the viands set out at funeral feasts; which feasts were in use among the Jews as well as the Gentiles; and, for any thing that appears, were not forbidden by the law, except to the priests; who were to take no part in the ceremonies of interments, except of their nearest relations. But such viands were unclean, and brought a temporary uncleanness upon all who partook of them. See note (F).

^g All," i. e. all the people of the land. See Appendix, N° III.

^h Probably many of the inhabitants of the kingdom of Samaria fled into Egypt before the Assyrian captivity, and remained there to their death.

ⁱ Stupid. —— gone mad." Stupid, if he himself discerneth not the signs of the times. Gone mad, if, aware of the impending judgement, he flatters the people with delusive hopes; and, by that conduct, makes himself an instrument in bringing on that public ruin, in which he himself must be involved. For a fuller explanation of this passage see note (I).

^k —— his ways." either the ways which the prophet himself pursues, and then the prophet is threatened with judicial deception; or the prophet's ways may be the ways he recommends to the

bution are come ! Israel shall know it. Stupid is the Prophet (I) ! The man of the spirit is gone madⁱ ! In proportion to (K) the greatness of thine iniquity, great also 8 is the vengeance ! The watchman of Ephraim is with his God (L). The Prophet!—the snare of the fowler is over all his ways^k. Vengeance against the household^l of my 9 God (M) ! They have gone deep in corruption, as in the days of Gibeah^m. He will remember their iniquity, he will visit their sins.

10 As grapes in the wildernessⁿ I found (O) Israel ; as the first ripe upon the fig-tree, in the beginning of her season, I beheld your fathers. They of their own will (P) went to Baal Peor, and consecrated themselves to that obsec-

people ; and then they are warned against his prevarications. The former, I think, is the better exposition.

The watchman is here evidently a title, by which some faithfull prophet is distinguished from the temporifiers and seducers. But who in particular is this watchman, thus honourably distinguished, and how is he “ with his God ? ” I think the allusion is to Elijah and his miraculous translation. “ Elijah, that faithfull watchman, that resolute opposer of idolatry in the reign of Ahab and Jezabel, is now with his God, receiving the reward of his fidelity in the enjoyment of the beatific vision. But the prevaricating prophets, which now are, are the victims of judicial delusion.” See (N).

ⁱ —— the household of my God,” the priests and prophets.

^m See Judges xix.

ⁿ —— in the wilderness.” The wilderness is rightly connected with grapes, and is not to be connected with Israel. Here is no sort of allusion to the wilderness, through which the Israelites were led to the promised land, as some of the Jewish expositors have most absurdly imagined ; in which God found not Israel, but led him into it. The “ waste howling wilderness,” in which God is said to have found Israel, in Deut. xxxii. 10. is the wilderness of idolatry ; and the image there expresses the weak state of the Israelites, when they lived intermixed with idolaters, as strangers in Canaan, and afterwards as slaves in Egypt.

11 nity (Q); and as [my] love of them so were their abo-
 minations^o. Ephraim (R)! like a bird shall their glory
 12 flie away; there shall be no birth, no gestation, no con-
 ception^p. If so be they bring up their children, still will
 I make them childless, till not a man is left. Verily woe
 still awaits them, even when I turn away (S) from them^q.
 13 Ephraim, to all appearance (T), was planted on a rock (V)
 in a quiet habitation. But Ephraim is upon the point of
 bringing out his children to the murtherer.

14 Give them, O JEHOVAH—What wouldest thou give?
 —Give them an abortive womb and dried-up breasts;
 all their wickedness^r in Gilgal (W).

15 Truly there I hated them^s. For the evil of their per-
 verse practices (X), I will drive them out of my house,

^o The love, gratuitous; the abominations without inducement, but from mere depravity. The love, the tenderest; the abominations, enormous.

^p Baal Peor was the power presiding over procreation; making the women fruitfull, and giving them quick and easy labour. (See note Q.) Sterility therefore is threatened, with peculiar propriety, as the judgement for the worship of that idol.

^q —— turn away from them," i. e. when I give them totally up; no longer attending to their conduct, or visiting their sins; when I have done with them.

^r Requite them all their idolatries committed in Gilgal. At the beginning of the verse the prophet addresses Jehovah. Jehovah interrupts him, " What wouldest thou give?" i. e. what wouldest thou ask me to give them. The prophet resumes, and goes on to the end of the verse. Then Jehovah speaks again to the end of the 16th verse. The spirit of the prophet's prayer I take to be, that God would, in mercy, rather visit the sinfull people with judgements immediately from himself, than give them up to the sword of the enemy. " Let us fall into the hands of the Lord," said David. " for his mercy is great, and not into the hands of man."

^s —— there I hated them." The first great offence of the Israelites, after their entrance into the Holy Land, was committed while they were encamped in Gilgal. Namely, the sacrilegious peculation of Achan. (Josh. vii.) And to this, I think with Dr. Wells, these words allude.

I will love them no more; all their rulers are revolters.

16 Ephraim is blighted (Y); their root is dried up: they shall produce no fruit^a: even if they bring forth, yet will I slay the goodliest of their offspring.

17 My God will cast them away, because they have not hearkened unto him; and they shall become wanderers among the heathen.

CHAP. I. Israel was a yielding (A) vine; his fruit^a was answerable to his vigour (B). According to the increase of his fruit, he increased in altars; like the beauty of his land, he made the beauty of his images^b. Their heart is divided^c: forthwith shall they undergo their punishment. [God] himself (C) shall break down their altars, and de-

There, fays God, of old was my quarrel with them.

Gilgal was the place where the armies of Israel, upon their entering Canaan, first encamped; where Joshua set up the twelve stones, taken by God's command out of the midst of Jordan, in memorial of the miraculous passage through the river. There the first paslover was kept, and the fruits of the promised land first enjoyed. There the captain of the host of Jehovah appeared to Joshua. There the rite of circumcision, which had been omitted during the 40 years of the wandering of the people in the wilderness, was renewed. And, in the days of the prophet Samuel, Gilgal appears to have been an approved place of worship and burnt offering. But in later times, it appears from Hosea and his contemporary Amos, that it became a place of great resort for idolatrous purposes. And these are the wickednesses in Gilgal, of which the prophet here speaks.

^a Or thus, "Ephraim is smitten at the root; he is dried up, that he can bear no fruit," See note (Y).

^a The fruit here meant is not the fruit of good works, but the fruit of national prosperity; increasing population, abundant crops, numerous flocks and herds, public opulence, military strength.

^b His idolatrous altars were as numerous, as his national prosperity was great; and the exquisite workmanship of his images was as remarkable, as the natural beauty of his country.

^c —— divided" between God and their idols.

3 face their images. This very moment shall they say, We have no King; because we feared not the JEHOVAH; and a King, what could he do for us !

4 Negotiate (D)—Swear false oaths—ratify a treaty ^d—Nevertheless judgement shall sprout up, like hemlock (E) over the ridges of the field. The inhabitants (F) of Samaria shall be in consternation (G) for the great calf (H) of Bethaven. Verily there shall be mourning over it, of its people and of its priests, who exulted (I) over its 6 glory ^e; because it is stripped off from it, and with itself (K) also ^f shall be carried into Assyria, a present to the King (L) who takes up all quarrels ^g. Ephraim shall be overtaken in found sleep ^h (M), and Israel shall be disgraced

^a Negotiate alliances with one power and another—make a treaty with the Assyrian—bind yourselves to it with an oath.—Break your oath, and make a new alliance with the Egyptian. In spite of all measures of crooked policy, all acquisitions of foreign aid and support, judgement is springing up.

^e —— its glory.” The riches of its temple.

^c See v. 13.

^h —— in found sleep.” In a dream of security; when nothing will be less in his thoughts, than danger.

ⁱ The politics of treaties of alliance mentioned v. 4. An impolitic alliance with the King of Egypt was the immediate occasion of Shalmanezer’s rupture with Hoshea, which ended in the captivity of the ten tribes.

^k —— like a bubble, &c.” which no sooner swells, than it bursts.

^l The sin of Israel now exceeds the sins of those sinfull times, when every one did what was right in his own eyes; and it seemed right in the eyes of the whole tribe of Benjamin, to protect the outrage of the Sodomites of Gibeah. See Judges xix.

^m There—” i. e. upon that occasion, the quarrel with the tribe of Benjamin, on account of by

7 by his own politicsⁱ. Samaria is destroyed. Her king is
8 like a bubble (N) upon the surface of the waters^k. The
chapels also of Aven, that sin of Israel, shall be demo-
lished. The bramble and the thistle shall overgrow their
altars; and they shall say to the mountains, Cover us; and
to the hills, Fall upon us.

9 More than in the days of Gibeah is the sin of Israel^l.
There they stood^m. It overtook them not (O) at Gibeah,
10 the war against the children of iniquityⁿ.—It is in
my desire, and I will chastise them^o; and the peoples
shall be gathered together against them, when they are
tethered down to their two furrows (P).

11 Yet Ephraim is a trained heifer—I delighted in tread-

the outrage of the men of Gibeah. — they stood." they, the Israelites, "stood," set themselves in array for the attack.

* God gave the Israelites success in that righteous war. It may seem however strange, that it should be said, that the "war overtook them not," as if they had not suffered by it; when they were unsuccessful in the two first assaults, and were repulsed by the Benjaminites with a slaughter amounting, in the two days, to 40000 men. Judges xx. 21 and 25. But besides that the confederated tribes were ultimately successful; this loss, in proportion to their whole embattled force, which consisted of 400000 men (v. 2.), was nothing in comparison with that of the tribe of Benjamin, which was all but cut off. For of their force, which was 26700, no more than 1600 survived the business of the third day, in which the town of Gibeah was taken and destroyed. And of this remnant all seem to have been cut off afterwards, except the 600 men that fortified themselves upon the rock Rimmon; so that of the whole tribe not one forty-fourth part was left.

° It is in my desire, &c. Then I protected and gave them success.—But now it is my desire, that they should suffer due punishment, and I will bring punishment upon them.

— when they are tethered down to their two furrows." Or, — when they are tied to their two faults." That is, when they are reduced to a situation of such difficulty and danger, as to have no hope of deliverance by any measures of human policy, in which alone they place their

ing out [grain] (Q). Therefore I myself for good have crossed her neck^p —I will make Ephraim carry me (R) —Judah shall plow, Jacob shall harrow* for himself^q.

12 Sow to yourselves for righteousness, [that ye may] reap according to mercy^r. Break up your fallows^s; for it is time to seek the JEHOVAH, untill he come, and rain down righteousness^t upon you.—Ye have plowed-in wickedness, ye have reaped iniquity: ye have eaten deceitfull fruit^u, because thou hast trusted in thy own way^v, in the multitude of thy 14 mighty men. Therefore a tumult shall arise among thy peoples, and all thy fortresses shall be demolished†, as Shal-

confidence, but by choosing one or other of two alliances, the Egyptian or the Assyrian; in the forming of either of which they are criminal, having been repeatedly warned against all foreign alliances.

^p This and the following clause give the image of a husbandman mounting his bullock, to direct it over the corn.

^q The three first clauses of this verse express what had been done, for the instruction of Ephraim, by the Mosaic institution. The two last predict the final conversion of the Ephraimites, with the rest of the people, and their restoration to a condition of national splendor and prosperity. Notwithstanding the judgements that are to fall upon Ephraim, she was long under the training of my holy law; and the effect of that early discipline shall not be ultimately lost. I will in the end bring Ephraim to obedience—Judah shall be diligent, in the works I prepare for her; and the whole race of Jacob shall take part in the same labours of the spiritual field, with profit and advantage to themselves.

^r i. e. Sow such seed as may produce righteousness, i. e. your justification, in God's sight, that so ye may reap according to his exuberant mercy. (See Appendix, N^o. III.) The prophet speaks in this 12th verse. In the following, Jehovah takes up the discourse again.

^s Compare Jer. iv. 3.

^t The imputed righteousness of Christ.

^u —— deceitfull fruit,” fair to the eye, but without flavour, and affording no nourishment.

^v —— thy own way,” the measures of thy own policy.

^x Heb. The wickedness of your wickedness.” The idolatries practised in Bethel shall bring down similar vengeance upon you.

* See Appendix, N^o. III.

† See Appendix, N^o. III.

— man

man demolished Betharbal (S); in the day of battle the mo-
 15 ther was dashed in pieces upon the children. Thus shall
 Bethel do to you, because of your wickedness, your passing
 wickedness*. As the morning (T) is brought to nothing
 (V), to nothing shall the King of Israel be brought^y.

CHAP. XI.^a 1 When Israel was a child, then I loved him, and out
 2 of Egypt called (A) my son^b. No sooner they were
 called, than they were gone from my presence, They! (C)
 They sacrificed to Baalim, and burnt incense to graven
 3 images^c: although I was a go-nurse (E) to Ephraim,
 taking them (F) over the shoulders^d. But they would not

* The sudden and total destruction of the monarchy of the ten tribes is compared to the sudden and total extinction of the beauties of the dawn in the sky, by the instantaneous diffusion of the solar light: by which the ruddy streaks in the East, the glow of orange-coloured light upon the horizon, are at once obliterated, absorbed, and lost in the colourless light of day. The change is sudden even in these climates. It must be more sudden in the tropical; and in all, it is one of the most complete that Nature presents.

^a The Israel of this eleventh chapter is the whole people, composed of the two branches, Judah and the ten tribes. But "the house of Israel" is the kingdom of the ten tribes, as distinct from the other branch.

^b —— my son." Although the son, here immediately meant, is the natural Israel, called out of Egypt by Moses and Aaron; there can be no doubt, that an allusion was intended by the Holy Spirit to the call of the infant Christ out of the same country. In reference to this event, the passage might be thus paraphrased: "God in such sort set his affection upon the Israelites, in the infancy of their nation, that, so early as from their first settlement in Egypt, the arrangement was declared of "the descent of the Messiah from Judah, and of the calling of that son from Egypt." See Gen. xlix. 10. Numbers, xxiii. 22. xxiv. 8. and Deut. xxxiii. 7. See note (B)

^c —— graven images." For an explanation of this common expression see note (D.)

^d —— a go-nurse, &c." When a young child is first taught to go, the nurse places herself behind its back; and putting her hands forward, over its shoulders, brings them under its arms: and, supporting the child in this manner, paces slowly after it, taking step for step with the child. The allusion in the text is to that sort of nurse, who performs this office.

know, that I preserved their health (F²) amid the grievous
 4 plagues (G) of men^e. I drew them with the bands of
 love, and I was unto them as one raising the yoke^f upon
 their cheeks, and I spread provender^g before him.

5 They shall not return into the land of Egypt^h; but the
 Assyrian, He shall be their king: because they have refused to
 6 return [to me] (H). And the sword shall weary itself in his
 cities, and consume his divinersⁱ, and devour because of their
 7 counsels; and my people shall hang in anxious suspense till
 my returning^k. For they were called to a high degree^l—
 All of one mind (K), they would not (L) be exalted.

^e —— grievous plagues of men." The plagues of Egypt, which touched not the Israelites.

^f —— the yoke;" the heavy yoke of the Egyptian bondage. The expression of raising the yoke refers, as is well observed by archbishop Newcome, and before him by bishop Lowth on Isaiah, I. 3, to the custom of raising the yoke forward, to cool the neck of the labouring beast.

^g —— provender." The manna in the wilderness. Castalio, and the margin of the Bishop's Bible.

^h —— not return into Egypt." They were desirous of making their escape thither, and many families perhaps effected it. See ix. 6. But here it is threatened, that the nation in a body shall not be permitted so to escape.

ⁱ —— diviners." The stupid prophet, and the man of the spirit gone mad, mentioned ix. 7. See note (I).

^k The Israelites are not threatened with utter destruction, but a near approach to it. Till the season shall come for God's turning to them again, they shall remain in a state of doubtfull anxious expectation of relief, or of worse distress.

^l —— a high degree;" the opposite of "nothingness of condition," mentioned chap. vii. 16. See the notes on that place.

^m —— return." When I come a second time, it will not be to destroy. An indirect promise of coming again, not for judgement, but for mercy.

ⁿ —— the Holy One, &c." Dwelling with thee, but in a peculiar and extraordinary manner, not after the manner of men. I am no frequenter of cities in general. See note (N).

^o —— after Jehovah." Time will yet come, when they shall be converted.

^p —— children." It is remarkable, that the expression is neither "their children," nor "my children," but simply "children." The first would limit the discourse to the natural Israel ex-

8 How shall I give thee up, O Ephraim ? Abandon thee,
 O Israel ? How shall I make thee as Admah, place thee in
 the condition of Zeboim ?—My heart is turned upon me,
 9 my bowels (M) yearn all together—I will not execute
 the fury of mine anger ; I will not return^m to make de-
 struction of Ephraim. For God I am, and not man ; the
 Holy One in the midst of thee, although I am no fre-
 10 quenter of citiesⁿ. After JEHOVĀH they shall walk^o—
 Like a lion he shall roar—verily he himself (O) shall
 11 roar ; and children^p shall hurry (P) from the West. They
 shall hurry like the sparrow (Q) from Egypt, and like the

clusively ; the second would be nearly of the same effect, as it would express such as were already children, at the time of the roaring. But the word “ children,” put nakedly, without either of these epithets, expresses those, who were neither of the natural Israel, nor children, that is worshippers, of the true God, at the time of the “ roaring ;” but were roused by that sound, and then became children ; i. e. the adopted children, by natural extraction Gentiles. This and the next verse contain indeed a wonderfull prophecy of the promulgation and progress of the Gospel, and the restoration of the race of Israel. The first clause of this 10th verse states generally, that they shall be brought to repentance. In what follows, the circumstances and progress of the busines are described. First, Jehovah shall roar—the roaring is unquestionably the sound of the Gospel. Jehovah himself shall roar—the sound shall begin to be uttered by the voice of the incarnate God himself. The first effect shall be, that children shall come fluttering from the West ; a new race of children—converts of the Gentiles ; chiefly from the Western quarters of the World, or what the Scriptures call the West ; for no part I think of Asia Minor, Syria, or Palestine, is reckoned a part of the East in the language of the Old Testament. Afterwards the natural Israel shall hurry from all the regions of their dispersion, and be settled in their own dwellings.

It is to be observed, that the roaring is mentioned twice. It will be most consistent with the stile of the prophets, to take this as two roarings ; and to refer the hurrying of the children from the West, to the first ; the hurrying from Egypt and Assyria, to the second. The times of the two roarings are the first and second advent. The first brought children from the West ; the renewed preaching of the Gospel, at the second, will bring home the Jews. And perhaps this second sounding of the Gospel may be, more remarkably even than the first, a roaring of Jehovah in person. See Appendix, N^o III.

12 dove from Affyria; and I will settle them in their own houses, saith JEHOVAH (R). Ephraim hath compassed me about with treachery, and the house of Israel with deceit. But Judah shall yet obtain dominion^a with God, and shall be established^b with the Holy Ones.

CHAP. XII.^a Ephraim feedeth on wind^b, and followeth after the East wind^c. Every day he multiplieth falsehood and destruction^d. For while they make a covenant with the Affyrian, at the same time oil is carried into Egypt. JEHOVAH hath also a controversy with Judah; and is about to visit upon Jacob according to his ways; according to his perverse practices, 3 he will recompense unto him. In the womb he took his brother by the heel, and in his adult vigour (A) he had 4 power with God. Even matched with the angel (B) he had

^a —— obtain dominion." A promissory allusion to a final restoration of, the Jewish monarchy.

^b —— established." The word may signify either the constancy of Judah's fidelity to the "Holy Ones;" or the firmness of the support, which he shall receive from them. "The Holy Ones," the Holy Trinity. By the use of this plural word the prophecy clearly points to the conversion of the Jewish people to the Christian faith. See note (S.)

^c The prophet speaks to the end of the 6th verse; then God.

^d —— feedeth on wind;" pursues measures, from which he reaps no advantage: his forbidden and impolitic alliances.

— East wind." The females of some animals, mares, in particular, are supposed to conceive heat, by snuffing the dry East wind. So the Israelites, by their foreign alliances, were inflamed with the love of idolatry.

— destruction;" i. e. multiplying his falsehood he multiplies the causes of his own destruction. See Appendix, N^o. III.

— spake with us;" that is God, spake with us in the loins of Jacob. The things spoken certainly concerned Jacob's posterity, as much, or more than himself. See note (E). Observe that the taking of his brother by the heel is not mentioned in disparagement of the Patriarch. On the contrary, the whole of these two verses is a commemoration of God's kindness for the

power, and was endued with strength (C). He had wept (D), and made supplication. At Bethél he found the angel,
 5 who spake with us there^e; even JEHOVAH God of Hosts,
 6 JEHOVAH in his memorial^f. Thou^g therefore turn unto thy God; keep to Charity and Justice (G), and ever look out for thy God.

7 ^hCanaan the Trafficker (H)! The cheating balances in his hand! He has set his heart upon over-reaching (I).
 8 Nevertheless Ephraim shall sayⁱ, Although I became rich, I acquired to myself [only] sorrow; all my labours pro-
 9 cured not for me, what may expiate iniquity (K). But I, JEHOVAH, am thy God from [thy first deliverance from] the land of Egypt. I will yet again make thee dwell in tents,
 10 as in the days of the solemn assembly. I have spoken [coming] upon the prophets (L), I have also multiplied vision;

ancestor of the Israelites, on which the prophet finds an animated exhortation to them, to turn to that God, from whom they might expect so much favour. This favour of God for Jacob displayed itself, when he was less than an infant; for, before he was born, he took his brother by the heel; and, in his adult vigour, he was endued with such strength, as to prevail against the angel.

ⁱ —— his memorial; i. e. God's memorial. His appropriate, perpetual, incommunicable name, expressing his essence. See note (F.)

^h Thou therefore, O Israel, encouraged by the memory of God's love for thy progenitor, and by the example, which thou haft in him, of the efficacy of weeping and supplication, turn to thy God in penitence and prayer, and in the works of righteousness; and ever, under all circumstances, and at all times, look out for his mercy and aid, and weary not with expectation of his coming.

^g God says to the prophet, instead of turning to me, and keeping to works of charity and justice, he is a mere heathen huckster. Thou haft miscalled him "Jacob." He is Canaan. Not Jacob, the godly, the heir of the promise. Canaan the cheat, the Son of the Curse.

ⁱ Nevertheless, the time will come, when Ephraim will repent and say, &c. What follows is the penitent confession of the Ephraimites, in the latter days, wrought upon at last by God's judgment and mercies.

and, by the ministry of the prophets, I have shewn similitudes^k.

11 Was there idolatry in Gilead? Surely in Gilgal they
are become vanity. They sacrifice bullocks; their altars
12 also are as heaps upon the ridges of the field^l. But Ja-
cob^m fled into the field of Syria, and Israel became a ser-
13 vant for a wife, and for a wife he kept watch (M). There-
fore by a prophet JEHOVAH brought up Israel out of
14 Egypt, and by a prophet was he tended (N). Ephraim
has given bitterest provocation. Therefore his mur-
thers shall be upon him—He shall be forsaken—And
his masterⁿ shall requite unto him all his blasphemies.

* Compelling the prophets to perform symbolical actions; as, in the case of Isaiah, going naked; Jeremiah, binding himself; Ezekiel, lying on one side; not mourning for his wife; Hosea's marriage; and many other instances.

^l The tribes settled about Gilead, beyond Jordan, were already captivated by Tiglath-pileser. God, by the prophet, declares, that the idolatry still practised in Gilgal was equally abominable, and would bring down similar judgements upon the remaining tribes, on the West of Jordan.

^m So opposite to thine was the conduct of thy father Jacob, that he fled into Syria, to avoid an alliance with any of the idolatrous families of Canaan; and, in firm reliance on God's promises, submitted to the greatest hardships. And in reward of his faith, God did such great things for his posterity, bringing them out of the land of Egypt, and leading them through the wilderness like sheep, by the hand of his servant Moses.

ⁿ — his master; that is, his conqueror, who shall hold him in servitude, and be the instrument of God's just vengeance.

^o The former part of the verse describes the consequence and pre-eminence of Ephraim, in his own country, and among the neighbouring nations; the latter part, his diminution and loss of consequence by his idolatry.

^p Spoken ironically.

^q This verse briefly describes the progress of idolatry among the ten tribes, from the time of
When

CHAP. I When Ephraim spake, there was dread: he was ex-
 XII. alted in Israel. But he offended in Baal, and died ^a. And
 2 now they repeat [their] sin: and, (A) in their great wis-
 dom ^b, they have made to themselves molten images (B) of
 their silver; idols, the workmanship of artificers. Their
 finishing is (C), that they say, “ let the sacrificers of men
 3 kiss the calves^c. ” Therefore they shall be as the cloud of
 the morning, and as the dew which passeth away early ^d;
 as chaff driven by the whirlwind from the threshing floor,
 4 and as smoke from the chimney. Yet I JEHOVAH am thy
 God from [thy first deliverance from] the land of Egypt;
 and thou shalt know no God but me ^e, for saviour there is
 none beside me.

the introduction of the worship of the Tyrian Baal in the reign of Ahab, which may be reckoned its commencement. From this time they were daily multiplying their idols, and adopting all the abominations of the heathen rites. The earlier worship of Jeroboam's calves was the least part of their guilt; for it was not properly idolatry; it was a schismatrical worship of the true God, under disallowed emblems, and by a usurping priesthood. But at length superstition made such a progress among them, that human sacrifices were made an essential rite in the worship of the calves. And this was the finishing stroke, the last stage of their impiety; that they said, “ Let the sacrificers of men kiss the calves.” Let them consider themselves as the most acceptable worshippers, who approach the image with human blood.—“ Kiss the calves;” i. e. worship the calves. Among the antient idolaters, to kiss the idol was an act of the most solemn adoration. Thus we read in Holy Writ of “ all the knees which have not bowed to Baal, and every mouth which hath not kissed him.” Tully mentions a brazen statue of Hercules at Agrigentum, in which the workmanship of the mouth was sensibly worn by the frequent kisses of the worshippers. And in allusion to this rite, the Holy Psalmist, calling upon the apostate faction to avert the wrath of the incarnate God, by full acknowledgement of his Divinity, bids them “ kiss the son;” i. e. worship him. See more about human sacrifices note (D).

^a Compare vi. 4.

^b — thou shalt know no God but me;” i. e. thou shalt not experience the power and pro-

5 I sustained thee (E) in the wilderness. In the land of
parching thirst (F), as in their own pastures: and they
6 were fed to the full (G). Fed to the full, and their heart
was lifted high;—for that very reason^f they forgat me.
7 Therefore I will be unto them as a lion; as a leopard by
8 the way side (H) I will lye upon the watch (I). I will
meet them as the bereaved bear, and I will rend the caul
of their heart: like a lioness I will devour them upon the
spot (K). The wild beast^g shall tear them limb from
limb (M).

9 It is thy destruction (N), O Israel, that upon me [alone

tection of any other. Those thou callest thy Gods will be able to do nothing for thee.

^f — for that very reason." My kindness itself was the occasion of their ingratitude; for, in the pride of heart, which the miraculous supply of their wants for so long a time produced in them, they forgot their benefactor.

^g God, in a paroxysm as it were of indignation, calls himself the wild Beast. See note (L).

^h Powerfull as my protection would have been, O Israel, hadst thou placed thy reliance and hope upon me exclusively; thou hast broken the covenant, thou hast sought to other succour, thou hast formed alliances with the heathen, and even courted the protection of their Gods. I therefore, in my wrath, withdraw from thee my special aid; and, since forsaken of me, thou hast no other helper, thy ruin must ensue. Thus thy great privilege, to have God alone for thy defence, becomes the occasion of thy destruction. What follows is angry expostulation, in broken sentences.

ⁱ Where is thy king? &c." This vehement redoubled interrogation seems to suppose a denial on the part of the Israelites of the helpless ruined state, asserted, in the former verse, as the consequence of God's withdrawing his protection. Do you deny this? Do you pretend that you have still means of defence, hope of deliverance? You rely upon the policy or prowess of your monarch. Where is he, this wise and mighty king? Tell me in what quarter? Your judges, your provincial rulers, where are they? Let see what deliverance this king and these rulers can effect.

10 it lies] to help thee ^h. Where (O) is thy King? Where now is he? To save thee forsooth (P) in all thy cities.—And 11 thy Judges? (Q) Inasmuch as thou saidst, Give me a King and Rulers, I gave thee a King in mine anger^k, and I take him away in my fury.

12 The iniquity of Ephraim is faggotted up^l; his sin 13 is hoarded^l. The pangs of a travailing woman are coming upon him—He is of the thoughtless race (R), for it is the critical moment, when he ought not to stand still; —the children are^m in the aperture (S).

^k —— I gave thee a king in mine anger.” It is not to be concluded from this expression, that God dislikes the monarchical form of government. If this were the place for the discussion, it were easy to shew, that the monarchical is the form most approved in Holy Writ; as it was also among the heathen the favourite government of the heroic ages. But the original form of government in Israel was a monarchy; in which God himself was the monarch, and the priests, prophets, and judges, were his ministers. When the Israelites therefore desired to have a king, they forgot that they had a king already; the Lord of all the Earth condescending to be in a peculiar manner their immediate sovereign. Their petition for a king was in contempt of that sovereignty of God; and this was the circumstance, by which they incurred God’s displeasure in that petition. I would observe that the seven verses of this chapter, from the 5th to the 11th inclusively, form a section which regards the whole race of Israel in general. At the 12th verse the prophecy turns again on Ephraim in particular.

^l —— faggotted up—hoarded” in God’s remembrance.

^m —— the aperture,” Heb. —— the breach.” They are actually passing through the opening of the parts distended by the throes of labour. It is the very moment, when the pains must terminate in the delivery, or the death of the woman. A proverbial expression for a crisis of extreme danger, and doubtfull catastrophe. See Is. xxxvii. 3. At such a moment as this, thoughtless Ephraim is supine and unconcerned.

14 (T) From the power of HELLⁿ I will redeem them. From DEATH I will reclaim them^o. DEATH! I will be thy^p Pestilence (V). HELL! I will be thy^p Burning Plague (W).

15 (X) No repentance is discoverable to my eye^q! Nay in truth he is run wild among savage beasts (Y). The East wind (Z) shall come. JEHOVAH is raising up the blast (Z) from the wilderness; and he shall dry up his fountain, and lay dry his spring (AA) shall HER^r. He shall plunder the store 16 house of all goodly vessels^s. Samaria is found guilty,—

ⁿ —— Hell." Not the place where the damned are to suffer their torment; but the invisible place, where the departed souls of the deceased remain, till the appointed time shall come for the re-union of soul and body. This is the only Hell of the Old Testament; though, by an abuse of the word, the place of torment is the first notion it presents to the English reader. But the English word Hell properly imports no more than the invisible or hidden place, from the Saxon "helan," to cover over.

In the New Testament we find the word Hell in our English Bibles in twenty-one passages in all. In nine of these it signifies the place of torment; namely, in these, Matt. v. 22. 29, 30. x. 28. xviii. 9. xxiii. 15. 33. Mark ix. 47. Luke xii. 5. In the other twelve, simply the region of departed spirits. And in this same sense it is used in the Apostle's Creed. "He descended into hell." Of this place we know little, except that to those, who die in the Lord, it is a place of comfort and rest. Not a jacobinical paradise of eternal sleep and senselessness; but a place of happy rest and tranquil hope. In the prophetic imagery it is often mentioned, as a dark cave deep in the bowels of the earth. Sometimes it is personified as in this passage.

^o As my property, by the right of an owner.

^p —— Pestilence," the putrid plague-fever, —— Burning Plague." The solstitial inflammation, which seizes and kills in an instant. See note (W).

^q The frequent and sudden transitions from threatening to promise, from indignation to pathetic persuasion, and the contrary, produce much obscurity in the latter part of this prophet; which however disappears, when breaks are made in the proper places. In the 13th verse, the peril of Ephraim's situation, arising from his own hardened thoughtlessness, is described in the most striking images. In the 14th, God the Saviour comforts him with the promise of the final deliverance that

that she hath rebelled against her God. By the sword they shall fall; their infants shall be dashed in pieces, and their pregnant women shall be ripped up.

CHAP. I Return, O Israel^b, unto JEHOVAH thy God, for thou
 XIV.^a 2 hast fallen by thine iniquity. (A) Take with you words^c,
 and return unto JEHOVAH. Say unto him, Take away all
 iniquity, and accept the good^d. So will we render thee
 3 bullocks (C), our own lips^e. The Assyrian shall not save
 us; we will mount no cavalry, and no more we will say

and salvation. In these words, "No repentance is discoverable to my eye," the Saviour complains, that these terrors and these hopes are all ineffectual. That he perceives no signs of repentance wrought by them. The Hebrew sounds literally, "Repentance is hidden from mine eyes." The total defect of the thing is most strongly expressed in the assertion, that nothing of it is to be discerned by the all-searching eye of the Divine Saviour. This complaint of universal impenitence introduces new threatening, with which the chapter ends. — "run wild among savage beasts." Broken loose from the restraints of God's holy law, given up to his depraved appetites, and turned mere heathen. For the heathen are the savage beasts. This is an exaggeration of the complaint of Ephraim's impenitence. He is become such perfect heathen, in his present manners, that his case seems desperate. See Appendix, N^o III.

^f — He." Either Jehovah, or the conqueror represented under the image of the wind.

^g — all goodly vessels." Every article of ornamental furniture, of costly materials and exquisite workmanship.

^a In this xivth chapter, the Prophet is the speaker to the end of verse 3. Then to the end of verse 6, God, the Saviour. In verse 7, the Prophet; verse 8, the Saviour; verse 9, the Prophet.

^b — Israel." The whole family of Israel, in both its branches, is addressed.

^c Take with you words, i. e. a set form of supplication.

^d Take away all iniquity —" i. e. Take entirely away the sinfull principle within us. Take away the carnal heart of the old Adam. "Create in me a clean heart, O God, and renew a right spirit within me." And then, when we are thus begotten again unto holiness by thy Spirit, "accept the good :" accept, as good, what, so regenerate, we shall be enabled to perform. See note (B).

^e — bullocks, our own lips." Lips are here put for praises and thanksgivings uttered by

" Our

“ Our Gods are ye,” to the work of our own hands : inasmuch as with Thee the fatherless obtaineth fond protection.

4 I will restore their conversion^f. I will love them gratuitously^g; for mine anger is departed from me (D). I 5 will be as the dew unto Israel ; he shall blossom as the lily, and strike his roots like [the forest-trees of] Lebanon^h. His suckers shall spread farther and farther (E); and he shall be like the olive tree, for his beauty, and a smell [shall be] in him like [the smell of] Lebanonⁱ.

the lips. This kind of metonymy, which puts the cause or instrument for the effect, is very frequent with the sacred writers. By calling vocal devotions bullocks, the phraseology shews, that this form of supplication is prepared for those times, when animal sacrifices will be abolished, and prayer and thanksgiving will be the only offering.

“ —— their conversion.” i. e. their converted race. I take conversion as a collective noun, for converts ; like captivity, for the captives, and dispersion, for the dispersed. The converted nation God promises to restore to his favour, and to a situation of prosperity and splendour.

“ g —— gratuitously.” Are good works then nothing, you will say. “ Is there no place at all for them in the doctrine of Repentance ? I answer, that hitherto the discourse hath been about remission of sins, and the gift of the Holy Ghost. These are entirely gratuitous, and not of our merit, but simply of the inexhaustible goodness and compassion of God. Therefore, when we speak of the remission of sins, it is right to be silent about our own works ; which, because they are done without the Holy Spirit, although with regard to civil society they may not be bad, yet cannot be called good, and ought not ; because of the unclean heart, from which they proceed. But when through faith we have received remission of sins, and, together with that the gift of the Holy Ghost ; forthwith from the heart, as from a pure fountain, come forth works alio good, and well-pleasing to God. For, although by reason of the remains of original sin, the obedience even

THEY

7 THEY SHALL RETURN (F). Sitting under his shadow^k, they shall abound in corn (G). They shall germinate like the vine, [and] be famous (H) as the wine of Lebanon^l.

8 Ephraim (I)! What have I to do any more with idols^m? I have answered him. And I will make him flourish (K), like a green fir-tree. From me thy fruit is supplied.

9 Who is wise? for he will consider these things; intelligent? for he shall comprehend (L) them. For straight and even (M) are the ways of JEHOVAHⁿ, and in them

“ of the Saints is not perfectly pure, yet on account of faith in Christ it is pleasing and acceptable to God.” Luther, in his Commentary upon this chapter.

^k Lebanon is put by metonymy in the Hebrew for the forests growing on it.

^l —— the smell of Lebanon.” The mountain is celebrated by travellers for the fragrance of the greens, that cloth its sides. Maundrell found the great rupture, “ which runs at least seven hours travel directly up from the sea, and is on both sides exceeding steep and high, clothed with fragrant greens from top to bottom.” Compare Cant. iv. 11.

^m —— his shadow,” i. e. the shadow of Jehovah.

ⁿ —— as the wine of Lebanon.” The Phœnician wines in general were esteemed by the ancients; especially those of Tripolis, Tyre, and Berytus, places at the foot of Lebanon, or very near it: and the wines of that country still are excellent. “ Le vin du Mont Liban, dont le Prophète Osée a fait déjà l'éloge, est encore excellent.” Niebuhr, Voyage. tom. II. p. 366.

^m Ephraim —— idols.” An exultation of Jehovah over idols. Ephraim! Even he is returned to me. I have no more contest to carry on with idols. They are completely overthrown. My sole Godhead is confessed.

ⁿ The ways of Jehovah are the ways which Jehovah himself takes, in his moral government of the world; and the ways of godliness, which he prescribes to man. These taken together are

shall the justified (N) (O) proceed^o, but revolters (P) shall stumble^q.

“ the ways of Jehovah.” They are straight, because they go straight forward, without deviation, to the end; the happiness of man, and the glory of God.

“ — shall the justified proceed.” In the ways of God, as they have been described, “ the justified,” those who by faith in Christ have obtained remission of their sins and the gift of the Holy Ghost, “ shall proceed;” they will be making daily and hourly approaches to the journey’s end. They shall be enabled to advance continually in the understanding of the ways of Providence, and of the way laid out by Jehovah for them.

“ — revolters shall stumble.” To the incorrigible enemies of God, the very scheme of mercy itself will be a cause of error, confusion, and ruin. “ As God’s ways are plain to the Holy, so are they a stumbling block to the workers of iniquity.” Ecclus. xxxix. 24.



CRITICAL NOTES

UPON

H O S E A.

CHAP. I.

(A) —— unto HOSEA” **בְּהֹשֵׁעַ** **אֵל** —— by Hosea” **בְּהֹשֵׁעַ** **אֵל** **הֹשֵׁעַ** —— unto Hosea” **אֵל** **הֹשֵׁעַ**

To speak *to* Hosea and *by* Hosea (**לְ** and **בְּ**) are phrases of different import. To speak *to* — expresses, that to him the discourse was immediately addressed. To speak *by* — that through him it was addressed to others. And that the speech, so addressed to others, was not the prophet's own, but God's; God using the prophet as his organ of speech to the people. The different import of these two constructions, so manifest in the Hebrew text, has been very judiciously preserved in the LXX, according to the Vatican, in the Vulgate, in the Chaldee, in Luther's Latin translation, in Calvin's, in our public translation, and in Archbishop Newcome's, but neglected by Castalio, Jun. and Trem. and by Houbigant. It must be confessed, that in some instances the prefix **בְּ** seems used as equivalent to **לְ**. But its most proper meaning is indisputably a mean between the opposite senses of **בְּ** and **לְ**, *from* and *towards*, denoting “rest, residence, or continuance in.” Hence it is the proper preposition of the instrument, as that in which the active power of the first efficient is placed.

And in such studied change from one mode of expression to another, as occurs in this passage, it is reasonable to suppose, that each is used in its distinct and appropriate meaning. Some passages indeed have been alleged, in which **בְ** after verbs of speaking to, might be rendered by the Latin “cum,” or the English “with.” As in Numbers xii. 8. “With him [בְ] will I speak mouth to mouth.” But in this, and every instance of the same kind except one, the parties in the discourse, or the supposed discourse, are God and the Prophet. And in every discourse of God with a prophet, much more is intended than the prophet’s information; the prophet is always the vehicle of a Divine Message to the people. Even in this text of Hosea, where what is said by God seems immediately to concern the prophet individually, being a command of something to be done by him in the economy of his domestic life; yet the act commanded being of public interest and importance, as it was typical of the case between God and the people of Israel; being commanded for that very reason, as a method of public admonition and denunciation; even in this instance, which in the first face of it has much the appearance of a private affair of the prophet’s, it was rather *by* than *to* Hosea that Jehovah spake; and the change in the original from **בְ** to **בְּ**, and back again, is not immaterial, and ought to be preserved in the translation.

Some imagine, that **בְ**, in this and similar passages, describes the manner of the divine communication with the holy prophets, not by an audible voice, but by internal suggestions. “Loqui in aliquo dicitur Deus, cum ea, quæ agi vult, ejus cordi, ut agantur, inspirat.” Encher. de quæst. V. & N. T. If this be the force of **בְ**, it renders neither “to” nor “by,” but “within.” “The beginning of the word of Jehovah within Hosea ——.” But I cannot but think, that in all this extraordinary intercourse which God vouchsafed to hold with man, the internal suggestion must always have been accompanied, not perhaps with an audible voice, but with some external sign, by which the prophet might with certainty distinguish the revelations of the Holy Spirit from thoughts arising in his own mind: and I very much doubt, whether internal suggestion alone was a method of communication. I have no doubt therefore, that “by,” rather than “within,” is the proper rendering of **בְ** in this passage.

(B) ————— was in this manner." This I take to be the force of the copula **וְ** prefixed to **יאמֶר**. And so it is taken by Castalio and Houbigant. The **וְ** is often to be taken as a particle of specification, equivalent to *silicet*, *nempe*, or *nimirum*. A very remarkable instance of this use of it we find in Job's memorable confession of his faith in the Redeemer to come. Job xix. 23—27.

23 Oh that my words were now written !
Oh that they were inscribed in a register !
24 That, with a pen of iron or lead,
For everlasting they were graven on a rock !

After this wish, **וְ** prefixed to **אָנִי** at the beginning of the next verse, very ill rendered "for" in our public translation, specifies the words, which Job would have recorded ; the matter of the inscription.

25 **וְאַנְיִידָעֵת** Namely, [these words,] I know the Living one is my Redeemer, &c. to the end of v. 27.

Vide Nold. not. 1208..

(C) ————— is perpetually playing the wanton" **וְיָגֵה תְּנַגֵּה** — to whore whores." This construction, in which the finite verb is connected with its own infinitive, for the most part expresses the perpetual repetition of the action, as a matter of daily practice and habit.

Buxtorf's distinction, that when the infinitive is put first, this construction expresses the greater certainty and evidence of the thing²; but when the infinitive follows, the continuance and frequent practice, seems to me to have no foundation. I think that, in either position of the infinitive, greater certainty, or greater frequency may be expressed, as the subject matter may require.

(D) ————— I will visit the blood of Jezräel upon the house of Jehu."

Jezräel, the mystical name of the Prophet's son, must be familiar to all who are conversant in the Holy Scriptures, as the name of a city in the tribe of Issachar, and of a valley or plain, in which the city stood : the city, famous for its vineyard, which cost the rightfull owner, the unfortunate Naboth, his

² See Thef. Gramm. lib. II. cap. 16. Reg. 2.

life; and, by the righteous judgement of God, gave occasion to the downfall of the Royal House of Ahab: the plain, one of the finest parts of the whole land of Canaan; if we may judge from the partiality of the Kings of Israel for the spot, who all fixed their residence in one or other of its numerous cities. Modern expositors, entirely forgetting the Prophet's son, have thought of nothing in this passage but the place; the city, or the plain. A mistake into which perhaps they have the more easily fallen, by reason of the explicit mention of the place at the end of the subsequent verse. But if the word *Jeziřael* be taken here as the name of a place, the threat of "avenging, or visiting, upon the house of Jehu the blood of *Jeziřael*," will signify, that the family of Jehu was to be punished for blood shed by Jehu, or by his descendants, in that place.

Jehu himself shed the blood of Ahab's family, with unsparing hand, in *Jeziřael*. But this was an execution of the judgement, which God had denounced by his Prophet Elijah against the house of Ahab, for the cruel murther of Naboth. And it may justly seem extraordinary, that this should be mentioned as a crime of so deep a dye, as to bring down vengeance upon Jehu's house. It is true, that when the purposes of God are accomplished by the hand of Man (which is the case indeed in some degree in every human action), the very same act may be just and good, as it proceeds from God, and makes a part of the scheme of Providence; and criminal in the highest degree, as it is performed by the Man, who is the immediate agent. The Man may act from sinfull motives of his own, without any consideration, or knowledge, of the end to which God directs the action. In many cases the Man may be incited by enmity to God and the true religion to the very act, in which he accomplishes God's secret, or even his revealed, purpose. The Man, therefore, may justly incur wrath and punishment, for those very deeds, in which, with much evil intention of his own, he is the instrument of God's good providence. But these distinctions will not apply to the case of Jehu, in such manner as to solve the difficulty arising from this interpretation of the text. Jehu was specially commissioned by a Prophet "to smite the house of Ahab his master—to avenge the blood of the Prophets, and the blood of all the servants of Jehovah, at the hand of *Jezabel*."² And however the general corrup-

² 2 Kings ix. 7.

tion of human nature, and the recorded imperfections of Jehu's character, might give room to suspect, that in the excision of Ahab's family, and of the whole faction of Baal's worshippers, he might be instigated by motives of private ambition, and by a cruel sanguinary disposition; the fact appears from the history to have been otherwise; that he acted through the whole business with a conscientious regard to God's commands, and a zeal for his service: insomuch, that when the work was completed, he received the express approbation of God; and the continuance of the sceptre of Israel in his family, to the fourth generation, was promised as the reward of this good and accepted service. "Jehovah said unto Jehu, because thou hast done well, in executing that which is right in mine eyes, and hast done unto the house of Ahab according to all, that was in my heart; thy children of the fourth generation shall sit on the throne of Israel."^a And it cannot be conceived, that the very same deed, which was commanded, approved, and rewarded, in Jehu, who performed it, should be punished as a crime in Jehu's posterity, who had no share in the transaction.

To avoid this difficulty, another interpretation is mentioned with approbation by the learned Pocock, in which "the blood of Jezrael" is still understood of the blood of Ahab's family, shed by Jehu in Jezrael: but, by a particular acceptation of the verb יָבַד, this is understood not as the object, but as the standard, or model, of the punishment. And the words are brought to this sense; that God will execute vengeance upon the wicked house of Jehu, in slaughter abundant as the slaughter of Ahab's family and kindred in Jezrael. But in this way of taking the words, a punishment is denounced for a crime not specified; which is not after the manner of the denunciations of Holy Writ. Besides, although the Hebrew words in themselves might not be incapable of this construction, if this were the only passage in which the phrase occurred; the truth is, it is a very common manner of expression. And wherever the phrase is used of "visiting any thing upon a person," the thing, which is the object of the verb transitive (without any preposition or prefix) is always to be understood as some crime, to be punished upon the person. And to take the phrase in any other manner here would be a mode of interpretation, which would tend to bring upon the style of the sacred writers the very worst species of obscurity—that of uncertainty; divesting the most familiar expressions of a clear definite meaning.

^a 2 Kings x. 30.

For these reasons, I am perswaded, that Jezräel is to be taken in this passage in its mystical meaning; and is to be understood of the persons typified by the Prophet's son—the holy seed—the true servants and worshippers of God. It is threatened, that their blood is to be visited upon the house of Jehu, by which it had been shed. The princes descended from Jehu were all idolaters. And idolaters have always been persecutors of the true religion. In all ages, and in all countries, they have persecuted the Jezräel unto death, whenever they have had the power of doing it. The blood of Jezräel, therefore, which was to be visited on the house of Jehu, was the blood of God's servants, shed in persecution, and of infants shed upon the altars of their idols, by the idolatrous princes of the line of Jehu. And so the expression was understood by St. Jerome and by Luther.

(E) And this shall be in that very day, when I break, &c." I suggest it to the learned to consider, whether the phrase so frequent in the Prophets, **וְהִיא בַּיּוֹם הַהוּא** is not to be differently taken, according as it is connected, or not connected, with the subsequent clause by the copula **וּ**. I am much inclined to think, that when it is not so connected, **יּוֹם הַהוּא** is to be understood of a time described, or marked, by some event already mentioned; and the force of the expression is to notify, that the event of the subsequent clause is to take place at that time. But when these three words are connected with the subsequent clause by the copula **וּ**; then I conceive, that the event of the subsequent clause affords the marks of the time, and gives the date of the event previously mentioned. So that in both cases a synchronism is described, but with this difference; that in the first case the event previously mentioned gives the date of the other; in the second case, the other event gives the date of that previously mentioned. And the nominative understood of the verb substantive, should be rendered, in the first case by the pronoun "it;" in the second, by the demonstrative "this." Thus in chapter ii. verse 16. (18 Heb.) **וְהִיא בַּיּוֹם הַהוּא נָאֵם יְהוָה תִּקְרָא אִישׁ** "And it shall be in that day (saith Jehovah) thou shalt call me Ishi." i. e. in the day when Jehovah shall do the things mentioned in the preceding verse. These things make the date of the time; and the calling of Jehovah Ishi is the event referred to that date. But in this passage **וְהִיא בַּיּוֹם הַהוּא וְשִׁבְרָתִי** "And this shall be in that very day and I break, &c." i. e. And this shall be [the thing last mentioned, the "demolition of the kingdom

kingdom of Israel, shall take place] in that very day when I break, &c." Here the breaking of the bow is the event that marks the date; and to that date, so marked, the threatened excision of the kingdom of the ten tribes is referred. I presume not to lay this down as a rule of interpretation, which will invariably hold. But I think it will, and I propose it to the learned, as a matter that deserves an accurate investigation. Whether the rule hold invariably or no, I cannot but think that the supposed distinction has led me to the true sense of this text; which, taken the contrary way, as I think it has been generally taken, as a denunciation, that, when the Monarchy should be abolished, its military strength should be broken, appears to be of less importance. For how should the military strength survive the Monarchy? But it was of moment to give the people warning, that the advantages, which the enemy would gain over them in that part of the country, would end in the utter subversion of the kingdom. For had this timely warning produced repentance and reformation; the judgement, no doubt, would have been averted.

(F) ——— insomuch as to be perpetually forgiving them." So I render with Jun. and Trem. Livelye, and Houbigant, and with the approbation of Drusius. The words will not bear the sense, in which they are taken by Arias Montanus; although it is adopted by Calvin, Castalio, Diodati, in our public translation, and by Archbishop Newcome. For the verb נָשַׁׁי, in the sense of taking away, never governs its object by the prefix נִ.

(G) ——— in the place where." So I render the words בָּמָקוֹם אֲשֶׁר, and for thus rendering we have the authority of LXX. Jerome, Vulg. Syr. and Chald. and, it must be added, of St. Paul himself². It seems, therefore, to have been without due consideration, that a different rendering has been adopted, upon the authority of some of the later Jews, by Jun. and Trem. Castalio, Grotius, Wells, and Houbigant. As if בָּמָקוֹם אֲשֶׁר might be equivalent to תַּחַת אֲשֶׁר — "instead of what," *pro eo quod*; a sense which I believe cannot be supported by a single instance. Junius objects to the other rendering, that to bear that sense the word מָקוֹם ought to have had the emphatic article prefixed. But Mr. Livelye well remarks, that in other places

² Rom. ix. 26.

this self same expression, in the self same form, is taken by that learned interpreter himself, in the very sense which in this place he rejects. Namely, in Lev. iv. 24. Jer. xxii. 12. and Ezek. xxi. 35. Indeed, in those places it can be taken in no other. I agree with Mr. Livelye, that this sense, confirmed by all the antient versions, and by St. Paul, is indeed the only true and certain sense of the phrase.

(H) 10. 11. By the exposition which I have given of the several parts of this passage, I hope I have shewn that it is an express prophecy of the final conversion and restoration of the Jews, not without manifest allusion to the call of the Gentiles. The word *Jezi'ael*, though applied in this passage to the devout part of the natural Israel, by its etymology is capable of a larger meaning, comprehending all of every race and nation, who, by the preaching of the Gospel, are made members of Christ and the children of God. All these are a seed of God, begotten of him, by the spirit, to a holy life, and to the inheritance of immortality. The words *Ammi* and *Ruhamah*, and their opposites, *Lo-ammi* and *Lo-ruhamah*, are capable of the same extension; the two former to comprehend the converted, the two latter the unconverted Gentiles. In this extent they seem to be used in chap. ii. verse 23, which I take to be a prophecy of the call of the Gentiles, with manifest allusion to the restoration of the Jews. Accordingly, we find these prophecies of Hosea cited by St. Paul to prove, not the call of the Gentiles solely, but the indiscriminate call to salvation both of Gentiles and Jews. He affirms, that God "has called us, [i. e. us Christians] vessels of mercy, afore-prepared unto Glory," *καὶ μόνον εἰς Ἰσραὴλ οὐλαῖς καὶ εἰς ἔθνη*, "not of the Jews only, but moreover of the Gentiles too."^a And it is in proof of this proposition, that he cites the prophecies of Hosea. And the manner of his citation is thus. First, he alleges two clauses, but in an inverted order, from the 23d verse of chapter ii. which seem to relate more immediately to the call of the Gentiles. "I will call them my people, &c.—and her beloved, &c." And to these he subjoins, as relating solely to the restoration of the Jews, that part of this prophecy of the first chapter, which affirms, that "in the place where it was said unto them, ye are not my people, there they shall be called the children of the Living God." From these

^a Rom. ix. 24.

detached

detached passages, thus connected, he derives the confirmation of his proposition, concerning the joint call of Jew and Gentile, to the mercy of the Gospel^a.

The allusion, which is made to these prophecies by St. Peter in his first Epistle^b, is not properly a citation of any part of them, but merely an accommodation of the expressions, “Not my People;” “My People;” “Not having obtained mercy;” “Having obtained mercy;” to the case of the Hebrews of the Asiatic dispersion before and after their conversion.

It is surprizing, that the return of Judah from the Babylonian captivity should ever have been considered, by any Christian Divine, as the principal object of this prophecy, and an event in which it has received its full accomplishment. It was indeed considered as an inchoate accomplishment, but not more than inchoate, by St. Cyril of Alexandria. The expositors of antiquity, in such cases, were too apt to take up with some circumstances of general resemblance, without any critical examination of the terms of a Prophecy, or of the detail of the History to which they applied it: The fact is, that this prophecy has no relation to the return from Babylon in a single circumstance. And yet the absurd interpretation, which considers it as fulfilled and finished in that event, has of late been adopted. “—— et erit numerus filiorum, &c.” v. 10. “Quando impleta est hæc prædictio?” says a learned expositor; and answers the question, “In reditu Babylonico.” But what was the number of the returned captives, that it should be compared to that of the sands upon the sea shore? The number of the returned, in comparison with the whole captivity, was nothing. “Then Judah and Israel shall appoint themselves one head.” Zorobabel, says Grotius. But how was Zorobabel one head of the rest of Israel, as well as of Judah? A later critic answers, “After the return from Babylon, the distinction between the kingdoms of Israel and Judah ceased.” But how was it, this distinction ceased? In this manner, I apprehend. The kingdom of Israel had been abolished above 180 years before; Judah alone existed as a body politic; and the house of Judah returned under their leader Zorobabel, with some few straglers of the captivity of the ten tribes. And no sooner were the returning captives re-settled in Judæa, than those of the ten tribes, joining with the mongrel race, which they found in Samaria, separated

^a Rom. ix. 25. 26.

^b Chap. ii. 10.

themselves from Judah, and set up a leader, and a schismatical worship of their own. Was this any such incorporation, as the prophecy describes, of Judah and the rest of Israel under one Sovereign? To interpret the prophecy in this manner is to make it little better, than a paltry quibble; more worthy of the Delphic tripod, than of the Scripture of Truth. Very judicious upon this subject are these remarks of the learned Houbigant. "The Prophet," he says, "in the 10th verse, passes from threatenings to promises, which is the manner of the Prophets, that the Jews might not think, that after the accomplishment of the threatenings, God would concern himself no more about their nation. Those promises seem to respect the final condition of the Jews, when they should collect under one head, the Meessiah; that it might properly be said of them, "Ye are children of the Living God." It is difficult to accommodate the words of this passage to the return from the Babylonian captivity. Those Jews, who returned from Babylon, were not so much as one hundredth part of the whole Jewish race; so little were they to be compared with the sands of the sea: nor did they appoint themselves one head. Zorobabel was indeed their leader, but not their single leader; and their form of government henceforward was not monarchical, but an aristocracy. Nor had they kings till the very last, when they were become unworthy to be called, "Children of the Living God."

CHAP. II.

(A) THE verb **רֹאֶה** is comparatively so seldom used otherwise, than as equivalent to the English verb "to say," with a declaration subjoined of what was said; that I hesitated long about the translation, which I venture to give of this passage; in which I take the verb as equivalent to the English word "to speak," without immediate mention of the words spoken. But, consulting the Concordances, I find many unquestionable instances of this use of it. See Ps. iv. 5. Ps. lxxi. 10. Gen. xliii. 27. 29. Ezek. xxxiii. 10. Ezra viii. 22. Ps. xxix. 9.

Esther

Esther iii. 4. iv. 10. vi. 4. Ps. lxxxix. 19. cxlv. 6. Exod. xix. 25. 2 Chron. xxxii. 24. 2 Sam. xiv. 4.

(B) The verb **פָּשַׁע** signifies properly “to flay the skin.” Hence, when applied to garments, it signifies, “to strip to the bare skin,” to divest even of the garments next the skin. **מָרַד** is a more general word, and expresses a less degree of denudation. And the two joined together express, “to strip perfectly one already half naked.” פְּנֵי אֲפַשִּׁיטָנָה עַרְמָה. *Ne nudam eam plane denudem.* This is confirmed by a similar expression in the Book of Job²—“thou hast stripped the naked of their clothing,” i. e. thou hast even divested the beggar, thinly clad, of that poor covering. The verb **נָצַר** sometimes signifies, “to fix, or leave remaining in its place.” But properly, I think, it denotes “to present openly to view.” Hence the full sense of the passage is, that the disgraced discarded wanton should be stripped stark-naked, and, in that situation, exposed to public view. To express this clearly in the English language, I have found it necessary to transpose the Hebrew words, which stand in this order. “Lest I strip-her-to-the-skin, naked, and-set-her-up-to-view as the “day when she was born.” But it is evident that the circumstance, in which the condition of the disgraced adulteress resembles that of the day of her birth, is perfect nakedness.

(C) ——— hath caused shame.” I take the verb **הִבִּישָׁה** actively, as it is taken by LXX, and archbishop Newcome. It is evidently the third person sing. fem. præterit. Hiphil.

(D) ——— her ways.” For **דְּרָכֶךָ** I read with Syr. **דְּרָכִיָּה**; the noun plural in regimine, instead of the singular, and with the suffix of the third person feminine singular, instead of the second. The LXX render the pronoun in the third person, instead of the second: but the noun they give in the singular: as if they redde **דְּרָכָה**; which reading is adopted by Houbigant and Archbishop Newcome.

(E) ——— a stone fence,” **גָּדר** is properly “maceria.” A low wall of loose stones, laid one upon another, without any cement or mortar.

² Chap. xxii. 6.

Such enclosures are very common at this day in Gloucestershire, and other parts of this island, where quarries of the stone, fit for the purpose, abound.

(F) ——— her outlets.” **נתיבות** are paths worn by the feet, often passing and repassing upon the same line. I think that here the word signifies “gaps” in a bramble hedge, or stone-fence, made by clambering over repeatedly at the same place. The text alludes to a double enclosure, an inner fence of loose stone, a bramble hedge on the outside: both damaged and broken in many places. The hedge is to be made; the stone fence repaired; the gaps in both closed; and all made so firm and strong, that it will be impracticable to find any way out. This enclosure is an admirable image of national difficulty, and distress, from which no human policy, or force, can extricate.

(G) ——— her shame.” **נבלתת**. Considering the connection of this menace with that immediately preceding, of carrying off the wool and the flax, the materials of the woman’s cloathing; I have some suspicion, that this word may signify the parts of the person, which modesty conceals. In Leviticus v. 2. and in other passages, **נבלת**, in reg. **נבלתת**, is used for a putrid carcase.

(H) ——— her vineyards and her fig-tree orchards.” I cannot but think the words **חנה** and **נפן** are used here, by a synecdoche, for plantations of vines and fig-trees. Certainly it cannot be said of a single tree, that it is laid waste, or made a forest.

(I) ——— my pay.” **אתנה**. The fee of prostitution. Compare ix. 1. —her necklace.” See Appendix, N° II.

(K) — Ishi — Baali.” The words **יש** and **בעל** are both applicable to a husband; and sometimes simply as a husband. But taken strictly, the latter signifies a severe; the former, a kind indulgent husband. “*Vox בעל propriè sonat & ἔχων habens quamcumque rem in suā potestate; quare ad “ maritum refertur per ellipsis, qui integrè dicitur השׁׁאַל בעל;* Exod. xxi. 3. “ — Sed vox sumitur in sacris locis sensu geminā significatione; vel sim-“ plice, pro marito absque alterius qualitatis respectu, ut Gen. xx. 3. Joel i. “ 8. vel ἐμφατικῶς pro viro imperioso, qui uxorem severe habet tanquam Do-“ minus,

“ minus, & omni suo in eam jure utitur; quonodo τῷ ψῃ, viro leni & be-
“ nigno, contradistinguitur; ut apud Hos. cap. ii. 15. & Jer. xxxi. 32.”
Vitrunga ad Jes. cap. liv. 5.

(L) ——— armour,” **מַחְמָה**. I think the word is used here for every accoutrement of battle, all offensive weapons, and defensive armour.

(M) ——— betroth thee with justice, &c.” A noun substantive after the verb **אָרַשׁ**, with **בְּ** prefixed, denotes the dowry, or that which the Man gives to obtain his spouse of her parents^a. Christ gave for the espousal of the Church his bride, **צְדָקָה**, his own justice; **מִשְׁפָּט**, his perfect obedience to the law; **חָסֵד**, exuberant kindness; **רָחֲמִים**, tender love; **אַמְנוֹנָה**, faithfullness, steady adherence to his part in the covenant between the Holy Three.

“ — Ubi diligenter expendi loca scripturæ, in quibus usus est vocis
“ אַמְנוֹנָה, ubi Deo aut Regi tribuitur; observavi convenientissimam ei esse sig-
“ nificationem, Fidei, sive Fidelitatis, Veracitatis, Constantiæ in repræsen-
“ tandis promissis: & est vere propria hæc & genuina vocis significatio, ubi
“ de Deo usurpatur.” Vitrunga ad Jes. xi. 5.

“ To myself I say, &c.” The copula **וּ** in the original expresses all this emphasis of reiterated asseveration^b.

(N) ——— I will perform my part, &c.” **אָעֵן**. The primary and most proper meaning of the verb **עָנָה** I take to be “ to re-act;” when B re-acts upon A, in consequence of a prior action of A upon B. But more largely it predicates reciprocal, correspondent, or cor-relate action. Thus it signifies the proper action of one thing upon another, according to established physical sympathies in the material world; or, among intelligent beings, according to the rule of moral order. It has always reference to a system of agency; and may be applied to any individual agent, in a system of agents, whose action regularly excites, or is excited by, the actions of the rest. Thus it may be applied to the act of the first mover, which sets all the rest a-going, as well as to the acts of the subordinate agents: as in vocal music, it is applicable to the singing of the first voice, as well as to the inferior performers, who

^a See 2 Sam. iii. 14.

^b See Appendix, N° III.

follow him. And in this passage it is applied, first to the action of God himself upon the powers of Nature ; then, to the subordinate action of the parts of Nature upon one another ; and last of all, to the subservience of the elements and their physical productions, to the benefit of man, and ultimately by the direction of God's over-ruling providence, to the exclusive benefit of the godly. In short, it expresses generally one agent performing its proper part upon another. And to this general notion all the particular senses of the word are reducible.

(O) ——— I will sow her as a seed for myself." Thus the learned Vatablus ; " *Et seminabo eam* — Hebraismus, pro *spargam eam* *instar sementis*. " *super terram.*" And Mr. Livelye : " *Ad ecclesiæ multiplicationem* *hoc* " *pertinet.*"

CHAP. III.

(A) ——— addicted to wickedness." I adopt the rendering of the LXX and Syr. which nothing opposes but the Masoretic pointing.

(B) ——— I own'd her," *ונָכַר*, from the root *ונָכַר*. See Parkhurst under *הַנְּכָר*. This was not a payment, in the shape of a dowry ; for the woman was his property, if he thought fit to claim her, by virtue of the marriage already had : but it was a present supply of her necessary wants, by which he acknowledged her as his wife, and engaged to furnish her with alimony, not ample indeed, but suitable to the recluse life, which he prescribed to her. Calvin observes, that the parsimonious gift, a sum of money which was but half the price of a female slave, and a pittance of black barley bread, typified the hard fare, which the Israelites were to expect at the hand of God, in their state of exile. See Appendix, N° II.

(C) ——— without Statue, and without Ephod and Teraphim."

An **EPHOD** seems to have been a garment, like a cloak without sleeves, covering the body as low as the pit of the stomach before, and as low as the shoulder.

shoulder-blades behind. It seems to have taken its name from the straitness of its collar, and the manner in which it was fastened about the person. The Ephod of the High Priest was of costly materials, and the richest embroidery; and it made a very principal part of his robes of office. But something of a similar shape, and of the same name, but made of plain linen, was worn by the inferior priests^a, and occasionally at least by other persons^b. But it appears also, that idolaters, at least the idolatrous Israelites, sometimes dressed up the images of the deities they worshipped, in a gorgeous Ephod, resembling that of the High Priest, and made perhaps in imitation of it. And this was so principal, and so sacred a part of the idol's robes, that the word was sometimes used as a name for the idol itself. Thus certainly we must understand Gideon's Ephod; when it is said, “that he set it up (וְיָדָה) in his own “city, in Ophrah, and that all Israel went a whoring after it; which thing “became a snare unto Gideon and his house^c.” This Ephod was made, according to the sacred Historian, of the spoils of the slaughtered Midianites, the purple robes of their kings, the gold of their ear-rings, and other ornaments. Insomuch that, in the costliness of the materials, it much resembled the sacred Ephod of the High Priest. But when it is said, that it “was set up “in Ophrah, and that all Israel went a whoring after it,” the robe is certainly put for an image, which was adorned with it, and drew so much admiration, that, whatever the original intention of the maker of it might be, in process of time it became an object of idolatrous adoration. The Ephod, therefore, appears to have been a principal ornament both of the true and of the false worship. And when the word is used, in the figurative language of Prophecy, as it is in this passage, to express in general the external grandeur of public institutions; it is in itself of ambiguous import, and its connexions in the context must determine, whether it refers to the approved forms of a pure service, or to idolatry. That it refers to the latter in the text, is evident from the connection with Statues mentioned next before, and Teraphim next after the Ephod. For both these will be found to be produced here, as principal articles of the furniture of idolatry.

^a 1 Sam. xxii. 18.^b 1 Sam. ii. 18.^c Judges viii. 27. 28.

We find the TERAPHIM among the faithfull, in the patriarchal ages, and among idolaters afterwards. For Laban, who was a worshipper of Jehovah, had his Teraphim^a, and Nebuchadnezzar had his^b. They seem to have been images, made in some general resemblance of the person of a man^c. The Teraphim of the idolaters were probably corrupt imitations of those of the true worshippers; for the antient idolatry was in every thing a mimickry and misapplication of the patriarchal symbols. The Teraphim of idolaters were magical images, used for the purposes of Divination; as appears in particular from Ezekiel in the place quoted. But the patriarchal Teraphim were probably emblematical figures, like the Cherubim; like those I mean of the simpler sort, which were seen in the ornaments of the more open parts of the tabernacle, and of the temple. The Teraphim I take to have been figures of the like mystic import; but of materials less costly, of coarser work, and certainly upon a smaller scale: though not of so diminutive a size, as to be carried about by the High Priest, according to Dr. Spencer's wild notion, concealed in the folds of the sacred breast-plate. For it appears, that one of these images was big enough to personate a sick man in bed^d. I imagine they were used, as most sacred ornaments of consecrated chapels, or oratories, in private houses. The use of them was certainly allowed before the law; and whether it might not be tolerated occasionally for some time afterward, when, by reason of the depressed situation of the Israelites, the tabernacle at Shilo might not be accessible to the greater part of the people, is a question, that may deserve consideration. For my own part, I would not take upon me to pronounce, that Micah, the man of Mount Ephraim of whom we read in the Book of Judges^e, was an apostate, and an idolater. The circumstances of the story incline me indeed to the contrary opinion; though his worship seems to have been, in a considerable degree, corrupt. But however that may be, however innocent the use of these images might have been in the patriarchal ages, and however it might be tolerated (which however I assert not) upon particular occasions in the earliest periods of the Jewish History, when the public worship was interrupted by the tyranny of the heathen nations, who were permitted from time to time to hold the Israelites in subjection; it is very certain, that

^a Gen. xxxi. 19.

^b Ezek. xxi. 21.

^c 1 Sam. xix. 13 and 16.

^d 1 Sam. xix. 13 and 16.

^e Chap. xvii. and xviii.

in process of time they were so much abused, to superstitious purposes, that the use of them was absolutely forbidden to God's people; and, long before the time of the Prophet Hosea, they were considered as a part of the worst rubbish of idolatry, which it became the duty of the faithfull to destroy. Just as the brazen serpent, which Moses had erected by God's express command, a sacred symbol, as our Lord himself expounds it, of the redemption, became so much an object of superstitious adoration, that it is recorded as one of the good acts of Hezekiah, that he brake it in pieces, calling it in contempt Nehushtan; "the brazen thing^a." When the Prophet Samuel would represent to Saul the enormity of his crime, in not having executed the command of God; he could find nothing worse, with which he could compare it, than the sin of witchcraft and Teraphim^b. The Teraphim are numbered among the abominations in the land of Judah and in Jerusalem, which Josiah put away^c. From all this I connot but conclude, that the Teraphim, in the text of Hosea, are to be understood of nothing but implements of idolatrous rites, images consecrated to the purposes of Magic and Divination. If the reader wishes for fuller information upon this subject, from which he may form an opinion for himself, let him consult Dr. Spencer's Dissertation on Urim and Thummim. Information he may derive from the various and profound erudition of that work, which will make him amends for the disgust, which the extravagance (not to give it a worse name) of the opinion which the author would sustain, if he has any reverence for the mysteries of the true religion, must create. Let him also consult the learned work of Franciscus Moncœius, *De Vitulo aureo*, particularly the 4th, 5th, 6th, and 7th, the 16th, 17th, 18th, 19th, and 20th chapters of the 1st book; Mr. Hutchinson, on "The Names and Attributes of the Trinity of the Gentiles," in the section, intituled, **אלhim תרפים**: the learned Julius Bate's "Enquiry into the occasional and standing Similitudes of the Lord God;" the same learned writer's "Critica Hebræa," under the roots **רפה** and **פצל**, Vitringa, upon Isaiah ii. 8. and xl. 19. But above all, let him consult the judicious Pocock upon this place. In these writers he will find great variety, and contrariety indeed, of opinions; and none perhaps that he will think proper, in every particular, to adopt. But he will collect much information from them all; and upon the whole perhaps will see reason

^a 2 Kings xviii. 4.^b 1 Sam. xv. 23.^c 2 Kings xxiii. 24.

to acquiesce in the opinion, which I venture to uphold; that the Teraphim were originally emblematical figures, of patriarchal institution; afterwards mimicked and misapplied by idolaters; and at last, generally and so grossly abused to superstitious purposes, that they became unfit for the use of God's people, and were absolutely prohibited and condemned. And this had taken place before the days of Samuel; consequently long before Hosea, in whose time they must have been considered as purely idolatrous and profane.

I come now to the STATUE, the first word of the three; which will require no long discussion. This, like the Teraphim, had been in use among the true worshippers in early ages; but was so much abused, before the giving of the law, that it was absolutely prohibited by Moses. A statue, *מִצְבָּה*, signifies any thing, more especially of stone, erected or set up as a monument or memorial; but particularly as a religious monument. That consecrated pillars of stone were in use among the Patriarchs, we learn from the history of Jacob. Idolaters, instead of simple pillars, set up images carved in the human, or other form, to represent the object of their worship. This abuse was certainly antient, and gave occasion to the strict prohibition of the Mosaic Law, “Ye shall make you no idols, nor graven image; neither rear you up *מִצְבָּה*, a standing image [statue, or pillar^{2.}.]” “After this prohibition,” says Dr. Pocock, “we cannot look on any such used in religious worship, but as a part, and so a sign, of the falseness of that worship. And so here therefore [in this text of Hosea] to say, the children of Israel shall be without such; is as much as to say, that they shall not have free exercise of their former ways of idolatry.”

If I may offer a conjecture, concerning the difference between these Idolatrous Statues and the Teraphim; I would say, that the Statues were of large dimensions, set up in public, as objects of popular adoration: the Teraphim were of a smaller size, and for different purposes; kept in the most sacred recesses of temples, or consecrated chapels, for magical rites, and rarely, if ever, exposed to public view.

Thus, since it appears, that both the Statue and the Teraphim of Hosea were implements of idolatry; no doubt can remain, that the Ephod, which is mentioned between the two, is to be understood of the idolatrous Ephod, not of

^{2.} Lev. xxvi. 1.

that

that which belonged to the holy vestments of the High Priest. As it is put between the Statue and the Teraphim, it may seem, that it may be connected with either: connected with the statue, it will denote the robe, with which the idol was cloathed: connected with the Teraphim, the Ephod of the Priest of the Teraphim. And in this connection (to which indeed the structure of the sentence in the original seems to point in preference) I would choose to take it. For thus we shall have idolatry described, by the three principal features in its external appearance: the Statue, the public object of popular adoration: the Teraphim, the images of the more secret rites of incantation: and the Sorcerer, or Hierophant, conducting the ceremonies and propounding to the consulters of the oracle the answers he pretended to receive, represented by the Ephod, the most remarkable of his robes of office.

(D) ——— and adore ——” **וְפָחַדְוּ אֶל**. The construction of **פָחַד**, governing its object by the preposition **אֶל**, I take to be singular. I apprehend, that when a verb, expressing any affection of the mind, governs its object by this preposition, that construction expresses the motion or effort of the mind, so affected, towards that object. The force of this construction here is to denote, that the converted Israelites will make Jehovah, and his goodness, the object of religious awe and admiration. The phrase is well paraphrased by the LXX, $\chi \dot{\epsilon} \nu \gamma \dot{\epsilon} \sigma \sigma \tau \alpha \iota \epsilon \pi \iota \tau \dot{\omega} \nu \nu \rho \dot{\iota} \chi \dot{\epsilon} \nu \iota \tau \alpha \iota \sigma \alpha \dot{\iota} \sigma \dot{\alpha} \tau \dot{\tau}$. The English word *adore* expresses the motion of the mind towards Jehovah and his goodness. Aben Ezra, Drusius, and Livelye, take the verb **יְפָחַדְוּ** here as equivalent to **יְחַרְדוּ**, cap. xi: 11. rendering — “ and hasten to.” “ Nam verba pavendi & trepidandi festinare & properare quandoque significant,” says Livelye. The observation is true; but as no instance occurs, in which the verb **פָחַד** is actually so used, after much hesitation between the two, I prefer the former exposition.

CHAP. IV.

(A) —— burst out.” פָּרַץ. A metaphor taken from rivers exundating the banks, and bearing down every obstacle to the impetuosity of the waters. The version of LXX, and the vulgate, retain the image of the waters, but fail in expressing the violence of the eruption. *κακυται επι της γῆς.* LXX. —— inundaverunt.” Vulg.

(B) By no means.” This is the force of יְשַׁׁבֵּב, urging and pressing the prohibition.

(C) —— like those who will contend with the Priest.” This is the natural rendering of the Hebrew words, and the sense agrees well with the context. The objections raised by Rivetus, and adopted by Houbigant, though they seemed of so much weight to Archbishop Newcome, as to induce him to alter the text upon the authority of a single MS. are entirely founded upon a misapprehension of the prophecy, and a misconception of the passage: upon a misapprehension of the prophecy, as if the ten tribes exclusively were the object of it: upon a misconception of the passage, according to the usual acceptance of it, as if litigation with the Priests were the crime charged: whereas it is only a simile.

(D) The word בָּנָה signifies a principal city^a.

(E) —— for lack of knowledge.” The Hebrew verb יַדַּע, and the nouns יָד and יָדָע are applied not only to every endowment and acquisition of the mind, which falls under the general notion of knowledge of any kind, but to that sort of conduct also, which may be referred to knowledge and under-

^a 2 Sam. xx. 19.

ftanding

standing as its proximate cause, or motive. And they more frequently answer to the Greek words *συνέγνω* and *σύνετις*, than to *ἐπίσταθαι* and *ἐπιστήμη*: signifying rather the voluntary application of the mind to the consideration of the practical good, than the mere possession of speculative knowledge. The English words, “to know,” and “knowledge,” by the constant use of them in our public translation to render the Hebrew words in all their applications to spiritual subjects, have acquired the same extent of meaning, and the same peculiar force: and have become familiar even to the English reader, in what may be called their Hebrew sense. It has been thought fit therefore to retain them in many instances, as in this, where other words might be more conformable to the habits of modern speech.

But in this place, “lack of knowledge” signifies a lack of this practical knowledge, arising from lack of instruction. The Priests are taxed with negligence of their duty, in not teaching the people, and in suffering a general ignorance to prevail; and for this crime, they are threatened with the abolition of their order.

In this part of the discourse, some obscurity has arisen from the sudden turnings of the speaker from the people in general to the priests in particular, and back again from the priests to the people; and from the difficulty of catching the exact places, where these transitions are made. In the 8th verse, it is manifest, the Priests are in question: for of no other persons it could be said, that “They ate the sin-offerings of the people.” And St. Cyril of Alexandria thinks, the first transition to them is in this place. Calvin, with more judgement, thinks they are first accosted at the beginning of this 6th verse. But in the 7th verse he thinks the discourse returns again to the people; and what follows he applies to the people generally, though not without particular allusion, as he supposes, to the Priests. But his exposition is embarrassed, and obscure. I am perswaded, that the discourse turns short upon the Priests at the beginning of this 6th verse, with the complaint of the people’s lack of good teaching; and turns away from the Priests again to the people at the 12th, and not before; and I have the satisfaction to find, that in this I have the concurrence of that great critic Drusius; who, upon “lack of knowledge,” in verse 6, says, “Hoc autem accidebat culpâ sacerdotum ——— Nam ordinariū munus sacerdotum erat enarrare legem, & populum ex eâ erudire. Mal. ii. 7. Deut. xxxi. 9. and xxxiii. 10.” And at the end of verse 11, he says, “Hactenus

“ Haetenus sacerdotum mores Propheticâ libertate insestatus est.” This division of the matter of the discourse makes the whole perspicuous.

——— I will also reject thee, &c.” Since the person threatened was to be rejected from being a Priest; he was a Priest, at the time when he was threatened: otherwise he had not been a subject of rejection. The person threatened therefore must have been the head, for the time being, of the true Levitical Priesthood, not of the intruded Priesthood of Jeroboam. This is a proof, that the metropolis, threatened with excision, is Jerusalem, not Samaria; and that the ten tribes exclusively are not the subject of this part of the Prophecy.

(F) ——— magnified.” **כִּרְבָּם**. The word is applicable to increase in any way, either in size, numbers, power, or wealth, &c. See Drusius and Luther on the place. But as the Priests were greatly magnified in dignity and power, and there is no reason to suppose, that they were multiplied by natural increase, in a greater proportion than the rest of the people; I think the thing intended here is the elevation of the order in civil rank and authority.

(G) ——— every one of them lifts up his soul,” **נַפְשׁוֹ**. All the antient versions give the pronoun plural. And eight of Dr. Kennicott’s MSS, among which are some which he esteemed of high authority, with others of De Rossi’s, read **נַפְשָׁם**. Archbishop Newcome adopts this reading, which seems indeed entitled to the preference. If the singular suffix be retained, it must be taken in that distributive sense, in which Jun. and Trem. understand it.

(H) From Archbishop Secker’s note upon this passage, it appears to have been the opinion of that acute and wary critic, that the public translation, “ because they have left off to take heed to the Lord,” was not to be brought, by any usual and natural construction, out of the Hebrew words, **כִּי אַתָּה יְהוָה עָזָב לְשִׁמְרָה**. He moves two questions: 1st, Whether the verb **עָזָב** can govern its immediate object by the prefix **לְ**? 2dly, Whether **יְהוָה** can be the object of the verb **עָזָב**? Upon both he seems himself inclined to the negative. “ Vix puto “ **עָזָב** infinitivum cum **לְ** regere; vel hominem dici Deum, sed Dei mandata, “ servare.” With respect to the second point, it is certain that **יְהוָה** never once occurs as the object of the verb **עָזָב**. Drusius refers to Zech. xi. 11, where

where the personal pronoun **אַתִּי** is the object of the participle **מַצְמִירִים**, as a passage which may warrant this construction. But in that passage Jehovah is not the speaker, to whom the personal pronoun belongs; nor is the participle used in the sense of obeying, or serving, but of observing, or remarking. “The poor of the flock which observed me, or watched me;” i. e. watched my actions. See Archbishop Newcome, and Dr. Blaney, on that place.

In the Book of Proverbs, however, we find a text, which affords an instance of a construction of this verb so similar to that, which our public translation supposes here, that if the connection of Jehovah, as the object, with the verb were the only difficulty, it might seem removed. In Proverbs xxvii. 18. the noun Adonai, not indeed as a title of Jehovah, but in the sense of a master, is the object of the participle Benoni of the verb **עָמַד** in the sense of “waiting upon,” in the capacity of a servant. But the other difficulty seems insuperable. After a nice examination, I scruple not to assert, that the verb **עָזַב** never governs its immediate object, the person or thing forsaken, abandoned, or left off, with the prefix **לְ**. It follows of necessity, that the order of construction cannot be that which our public translation demands. Namely, this, **כִּי עָזַב לְעַמֵּר אֶת יְהוָה**. For in this order, the sentence, **לְעַמֵּר אֶת יְהוָה**, is the object of the verb **עָזַב**, and connects with the verb by the prefix **לְ**.

The verb **עָזַב** always governs its immediate object without any prefix. But when a noun, following this verb, is connected with it by **לְ**, the noun expresses either the person to whom, i. e. to whose possession, use, and advantage, or the thing in return for which, as a more desired object, or the end and purpose for which (the **לְזַעַם** **לְזַעַם**) or, the time for which, the dereliction is made. Thus Ps. xlix. 11. — **וַיַּעֲזַב לְאֶחָדִים חִילָם** — and leave their wealth to others; i. e. to the possession and use of others. So Is. xviii. 6. **עַזְבּוּ יִהּדוּ לְעֵיט הַרִּים וְלִבְרָתָת הָאָרֶץ** — “—— they shall be left together to the bird of prey of the mountains, “and to the beasts of the earth.” And Malachi iv. 1. (Heb. iii. 19.) **לֹא יִעַזֵּב לָהֶם שָׁרֶשׁ וּעַנֶּף** — shall not leave them root or branch.”

Joshua xxiv. 16. God forbid — that we should forsake the Jehovah to serve other Gods;” i. e. to take up with the service of other Gods as a preferable service.

2 Chron. xxxii. 31. — **וַיַּעֲזַב הָאֱלֹהִים לְנַסּוֹתּוּ** — God left him to try him;” i. e. for the end or purpose of trying him.

Ps. xvi. 10. — **לֹא תַשְׁׁבֵּנְפָנָיו לְנַאֲלֵל** — “thou wilt not abandon my soul to hell.”

Lam. v. 20. “Wherefore תִּשְׁבַּבְנוּ לְאַרְךְ יְמֵינוּ dost thou forsake us so long time.”

These seven texts are the only instances in the Bible, in which a noun, or what stands as a noun, following the verb שָׁבָב is connected with the verb by לְ.

I have therefore adopted a division of the Hebrew, received by some learned Rabbins, and confirmed by a much higher authority, that of the Syriac version, and not contradicted by the LXX. I make a stop equivalent to a comma at שָׁבָב, and expunging the soph-pasuk at לְצָמָר, I take that word in immediate connection with the following words; so that תִּרְוֹשׁ, גְּנוּתָה, and שָׁמָר are accusatives after the infinitive שָׁמָר, and I suppose an ellipsis of the pronoun אֵלֶּךָ rehearsing the nouns גְּנוּתָה, גְּנוּתָה, and תִּרְוֹשׁ (than which ellipsis nothing is more frequent in the prophetic style), as the nominative of the verb יִקַּח. Thus, according to this division, “to give attention to chamberings, &c.” is either the end to which, or the object of preferable choice for which, they forsake Jehovah; and, as such, is connected with the verb שָׁבָב by לְ. Thus the construction is regular and natural, and the sense perspicuous, and well suited to the context. The learned reader will perhaps be the more easily reconciled to this exposition, and rendering of the text, if he remarks the similitude of phraseology in this passage, and another in the Book of Jonah, chap. ii. 10. מְנֻרִים הַבְּלָשָׁ�נָא חַסְדָּם שָׁבָב “(i. e. the vain rites of the false religions), forsake their gracious benefactor.”

(I) —— give them answers.” נָנַד לִגְדֵּל as a verb in Hiphil (for in that conjugation, and in Hophal alone, the verb is used,) is “to tell, relate, “make publickly or manifestly known,” by words, or other signs and tokens, of certain interpretation: also “to foretell.” And in this sense it is almost an appropriate word of oracular prediction: and so it is used here.

(K) Since thus it is.” — This I take to be the force of כִּי עַל. The phrase is more emphatical than “therefore,” in the English language, or than the simple copula in the Hebrew. It refers distinctly to what has gone before concerning the manners of the people, as the ground of God’s dealing with them in the manner declared in what follows.

(L) —— Israel is rebellious like an unruly heifer.” כְּפָרָה סְרָרָה סָרָרָה יִשְׂרָאֵל I restore the rendering of the Bishop’s Bible and the English Geneva. It was

? See Appendix, N° II.

changed

changed into what we now read in the public translation,—“ Israel slideth back “ as a backsliding heifer,” upon a supposition, that the actions of the restive beast, refusing the yoke, are literally expressed in the original by the word סָרַדָה, and that the disobedience of the Israelites is represented under the image of the like action. A notion which the apparent affinity of the roots סָרַד and סָרַר might naturally suggest.

The version of the LXX too is evidently founded upon a similar notion of the original, as literally describing the actions of the animal; but actions of a very different kind, not those of restiveness, but the involuntary running about of the heifer stung by the gad-fly. Διότι οὐ δάμασις ταρπούεται ταρπούεται Ισραὴλ. But there is certainly no ground at all for this particular interpretation in any use of the verb סָרַד, or of סָרַר, among the sacred writers: and our public translation is much more, than this of the LXX, to the purpose of the context.

The fact, however, is, that the verb סָרַד, or the participle, is in no one passage in the Bible, except this, applied to a brute. It is true, in Lam. iii. 11. we find the word סָרַר applied to a brute. But not to a domestic brute, in a restive or a frisky mood; but to a wild beast, sprung from his laire, and crossing the way of the traveller: and not to the wild beast immediately, but to Jehovah, in wrath and taking vengeance, represented under the image of the wild beast. And in the phrase in this passage, רִבְבֵי סָרַר, I take to be another word, not from the root סָרַד, but the Poel form of the verb סָרַר. “ He turned aside my ways.” That is, he scares me out of the strait path, and compels me to take a new direction. In the fifteen other passages (and no more) in which the word סָרַד occurs, it invariably signifies the perverse disposition, or disorderly conduct, of a moral agent; without any express allusion to any brute. It seems, therefore, at least doubtful, whether, in this passage of Hosea, the figure is not rather in the application of the participle to the heifer, than of the verb to Israel. And it seems safer to give what is indubitably the sense of the passage in plain terms, after the example of the author of the Syriac version, and the majority indeed of interpreters, than to affect to retain metaphors of the original, which may be merely imaginary.

It is worthy of remark, that in many passages of Scripture besides this, we read in our English Bible of “ backsliding Israel,” and of “ Israel’s back-

“ slidings.” But the Hebrew word, in all these other passages, is very different, and from quite another root. And that other word, in the sense of “ back-sliding,” is never, any more than this word סָרֵך, applied to a brute.

(M) ——— seed them in a large place,” בָּמֶרֶחֶב. This word is never used but in a good sense; and, for the most part, figuratively, as an image of a condition of liberty, ease, and abundance. I agree, therefore, with Grotius, that this is said with bitter irony. “ Est hic χλευασμὸς; irrigatio acerba; ex ambiguo. Latè pascere amant agni: Deus Israelem disperget per totum Assyriorum regnum.”

(N) ——— a companion of idols,” חָבָר עֲצָבִים. See Psalm cxix. 63. Isaiah i. 23.

(O) ——— their strong drink is vapid,” סָר סְנָאָם. The verb סָר, with an accusative after it with a preposition or prefix, will not bear the sense of “ going after,” which some have given it in this place. Nor can I think with Houbigant, that the verb in the Kal-form is to be taken in the Hiphill sense, the noun סְנָאָם being its subject, and the pronominal suffix attached to the noun its object. I agree with those interpreters, who take the noun סְנָאָם as the nominative of the neutral verb, which makes the construction natural, and the sense most apposite. It is well remarked by Drusius and Livelye, that wine, in that state which the Hebrew words describe, is called in Latin, Vinum fugiens. “ Si quis vinum fugiens vendat sciens, debeatne dicere.” Cic. de Off. lib. 3.

(P) The construction is certainly uncommon. But I see nothing in it so harsh and obscure, as to make an alteration of the text necessary. I give the sense which the learned Pocock approves, which seems to me to arise easily from the Hebrew words. It must be observed, however, in justice to Houbigant and Archbishop Newcome, that their omission of הַבּוֹ has the authority of three manuscripts of Kennicott’s, of the Syriac version, and the LXX, and was suggested by Archbishop Secker.

(Q) — (O)

(Q)—(O shame) For a long time I thought myself original and single in this way of rendering. But I have the satisfaction to find, that the learned Druſius was before me in it. He renders thus: “ Scortando scortati sunt, amant “ date (O Dedecus) protectores ejus.” And he makes this note upon O Dedecus, “ Primus ita exposui; an recte, judicent periti harum rerum, ἢ εἰ αἴτειοι ταῦ
χολτικῶν.”

CHAP. V.

(A) ——— Prickers.”, from the verb עָרַע, circumire, discurrere, obambulare, lustrare, latè per campos quaquaversum discurrere^a. It is applied, Num. xi. 8. to the people scattered over the plain to gather up the manna.

Hence the noun שׁטִים, in this place may naturally render those horsemen, whose office it was in the chace to spread themselves on all sides of the plain, to drive the wild beasts, roused from their laires or coverts, into the toils. Such persons, in our old English language, were called “prickers,” as I conceive from the verb “to prick,” i. e. to shew off on a mettlesome horse^b; because their office required, that they should be well mounted, and they were always galloping across the country in all directions. The noun is not yet become quite obsolete. For the yeomen that attend the King, when his Majesty hunts the stag, whose duty it is to keep the animal within convénient bounds, are at this day called the “Yeomen Prickers.” I take שׁטִים here in this sense, as the nominative of the verb העמיקו, and שָׁחַתָּה as the accusative after the verb. “Cursores profunda “dam ediderunt cædem.” In the Latin expression, “profunda cædes,” cædes is properly the blood shed; and the great number of murthers is represented under the image of a great depth of that blood. The imagery of the Hebrew in this place is exactly the same. But it is a figurative chace,

² See Appendix, N° II.

^b A gentle knight was *pricking* on the plain,
Yclad in mighty arms and silver shield,

His angry steed did chide his foming bit,
As much disdaining to the curb to yield.

Spenser, Fairy Queen. The

The wild beasts are Men, not influenced and restrained by true principles of religion: the principle hunters, the Kings and the apostate Priests, who, from motives of self-interest, and a wicked and mistaken policy, encouraged idolatry, and supported its institutions: the prickers, the subordinate agents in the business: the slaughter, spiritual slaughter of the souls of men.

(B) ——— their perverse habits." **מעליהם** I take this as the nominative case to the verb **מעוּנָה**, as it is taken by the Syr.

There are few words in the Hebrew language less reduced to any one precise meaning, than this very common one **מעל**. The true sense of which we shall therefore endeavour to ascertain. It is very obvious, that it is immediately derived from **לְלָא**, which the Lexicons give as a root, signifying, as a verb, "to do, perform, effect," in any manner; and, as a noun, any sort of deed, work, performance, action, &c. good or bad. And under this imaginary latitude of meaning, the lexicographers have contrived to cover their ignorance of the real definite meaning of the word.

The two words **לְלָא** and **לְלָה** are distinct roots in the Hebrew language; and each has an **לְלָה** descending from it, differing as much in sense, as in etymology, from the **לְלָא** derived from the other.

The first of these two roots **לְלָה** signifies, "to oppress, defraud, injure, to be unjust." This seems to be the primary meaning of the root, though the verb occurs but once in Kal, namely, in Isaiah xxvi. 10. But as a noun rendering, injustice, fraud, iniquity, unrighteous dealing, or an unjust or wicked man, it occurs frequently.

In the Poel form this verb signifies, to treat very harshly, to treat injuriously, contumeliously, and in this sense it is applied to inanimate things, to disfigure, to mar external beauty^a. Also, "to glean," because the vineyard, that is gleaned, is treated harshly, divested of its rich cloathing, and marred in its external beauty. In this sense both the verb, and the nouns deriving from it, are sometimes written defectively, without the **ו** after the **ל**; as **וְעַלְלָה**^b; for **וְעַלְלָה**. But in all these passages we find the **ו** in a great number of the best MSS, and in our common printed text the absence of the **ו** is marked by the Cholem point.

^a Job xvi. 15:

^b Judges xx. 45.

As

As a noun substantive, the word **לִוְיָה** signifies “a little boy, a child:” because the age of childhood is obnoxious to injury and ill usage. Some of the lexicographers would have it a fucking child. But for this there is not the least authority. The place where the notion of fucking would be most to the purpose is Isaiah xl ix. 15. But even here it is not necessary, and it is not expressed in any one of the ancient versions.

With this noun substantive **לִוְיָה** the feminine plural **לִוְלָות**, rendering, according to some, females of the herd or flock giving suck; according to others, pregnant females, or females that have just dropped their young, but more properly, I think, females that are “bringing up” their young, has no sort of connection. We never find the word **לִוְלָות** with a **ו** between the **ו** and the **ל**, or with the Cholem point to mark the absence of the **ו** in that place. It has no connection, therefore, with the root **לִוְיָה**. Its connection, in the sense of “bringing up,” with the other root **לִלְה**, “to rise, or raise,” is evident. There is another very remarkable difference between the masculine **לִוְיָה** and the feminine **לִוְלָות**. The former is never applied to the young of any other species than man; the latter to brutes only, never to the human species: notwithstanding that Calasio says, that the plural **עֲוִילִים** signifies “lactentes, parvuli hominum & bestiarum,” and that **לִוְיָה** as a verb sometimes signifies “lactare.” Both which assertions are erroneous.

To this same root the noun substantive **עֲוָלָה** or **לִוְיָה**, in the sense of a yoke, is to be referred.

From the Poël form of the verb, two nouns **מְעֻלָּל** and **מְעֻלָּל** are derived, both signifying, “a little child.” The former is sometimes written **לִוְיָה**. But the majority of the best MSS. give it every where complete, with the **ו** between the **ו** and the **ל**, and in the printed text the absence of the **ו** is marked by the Cholem point. The latter noun occurs only in one place, namely, Is. iii. 12.

If this noun **מְעֻלָּל** had any plural it would be **מְעֻלָּלִים**, which might be written defectively **מְעֻלִים**. But with this word, our noun **תְּעֻלָּלִים**, the immediate subject of this disquisition, has no connection.

Our noun **מְעֻלָּלִים** is found in 38 different passages; or in 39, if in Zech. i. 4. **וּמְעֻלָּלִיכֶם**, which some MSS. give instead of **וּמְעֻלָּלִיכֶם**, be the true reading. But it is not once found with a **ו** between the **ו** and the **ל**, nor with the Cholem point to mark the absence of a **ו** in that place. There is nothing therefore

fore, in the form of the word, to indicate any connection with the root **לִעְיָה**. We must therefore refer it to the **לִעְיָה** of the other extraction.

From the root **לִעְיָה**, “to ascend, mount upwards, to go or come up,” we form the re-duplicate verb **לִלְעָה**, by dropping the final **נ** of the primary root, and doubling the middle radical. In which way, however it may displease the Masoretes and their disciples, many verbs doubling Ain are formed from verbs quiescent Lamed He. Of which **פָּגָץ** from **כָּלַל**, **פָּגָה** from **כָּלַה**, and **לִלְקָד** from **לִלְהָה**, **רַבָּה** from **רַבְבָּה**, **לִלְקָה** from **רַבְבָּה**, are indubitable instances. To this **לִלְעָה**, from **לִעְיָה**, the learned Mr. Parkhurst would reduce the verb, which signifies “to glean.” **לִלְעָה**, he says is, to “ascend repeatedly.” He adds, “it is used for a repeated, “or second ascending of vines, in order to gather all the grapes, and may be “rendered to glean.” But in every one of the passages, which he cites, the verb is manifestly the Poel form of **לִעְיָה**. And I cannot find, that the verb **לִלְעָה**, from **לִעְיָה**, occurs in any other than the Hithpael form. And in this form it carries no marks, in its orthography, of a descent from **לִעְיָה**, but in its sense manifests its extraction from **לִעְיָה**. For it signifies, “to exalt or raise one’s self up, to assume and display superiority in a good or bad sense,” with or without just grounds.

From this verb **לִלְעָה**, which as a verb is found only in Hithpael, I derive our verbal **מַעֲלִילָה**. This noun is used only in the plural number. It denotes, therefore, something which is in its nature plural. And if it denotes actions of any sort, it must signify not any individual act, but a set or system of actions. And because it must connect with the sense of the primary root **לִעְיָה** (with which the verb most evidently connects), it must express some set, or system of things, which naturally ascend, mount, get uppermost. Upon these grounds I am persuaded, that the word **מַעֲלִילָה** denotes the moral or immoral habits of a man, as things coming over him, growing up, and, in the vulgar phrase, “getting the upper hand.” The learned reader will judge for himself, upon a critical examination of the 38 or 39 passages in which this word occurs, whether this sense be not well adapted to the context in every one of them; and whether every other sense, which expositors have offered, be not positively excluded by the use of the word in some one or other of them.

As the ascendancy of habit is the principal circumstance, which this noun expresses, it is applicable to all habits possessing that ascendancy, good or bad. This indifference of the natural meaning of the word appears evidently from

the

the use of it in Prov. xx. 11. That evil is not necessarily implied in it, appears from the application of it, in two other places^a, to the works of God. For the most part, however, it denotes evil habits.

It may seem, that the application of it to the works of God, in the two passages in the Psalms just mentioned, excludes the sense of habits entirely. For in God, philosophically speaking, there can be no habit. But the sacred writers, in speaking of God, confine themselves not to a philosophical style. They are studious rather of a manner of speaking, which may convey what is to be understood of God to the minds of men in general, even of those the least improved by science and philosophy. Hence it is that they speak, of the works and actions of God, in figures taken from the actions, not only of men, but even of wild beasts. The works of God, intended in the two texts cited, are not indeed those, which are daily, and every where, seen in the ordinary proceedings of his providence; but those wonderful works of mercy, which he was performing in favour of his chosen people for many years, indeed for ages, from the very beginning of the History of the Israelites to the Psalmist's own times; which, proceeding from the unmerited goodness of God, may be called, in the accommodating style of Holy Writ, works of habit. And however unphilosophical the manner of speaking may be, as it certainly is, the philosophical Greeks could find no terms, in their distinct and copious language, by which they could so well describe the immutability of God's perfections, as by words literally rendering "habit," or "character" "fixed by habit," *μέρων ἐν σανίδες ἥθει*.

This interpretation of the word **מִלְלָתָם** as rendering "habits," is much confirmed by the antient versions. In one passage, indeed^b, the LXX render it by *αισχυνα*. In three others^c, by *διατέλλεται*. In six^d others^e, by *ἔργα*. In another^f, by *παράγματα*. In the remaining 28 of the 39 passages in which the word is found, they render it *ἔπιτηδεύματα*; which is the word of the Greek language exactly rendering "habits." And by the same word *ἔπιτηδεύματα* it is rendered by Aquila, in four of the eleven passages in which the LXX give another word^g; and in a fifth of those eleven by Theodotion^h.

^a Ps. lxxvii. 12. and lxxviii. 7.

^b If. iii. 8.

^c Hof. iv. 9. v. 4. vii. 2.

^d See Appendix, N° II.

^e Ps. lxxvii. 12. lxxviii. 7. If. iii. 10. Jer. xxi. 12—14. xxvi. 13.

^f Jer. xliv. 22.

^g H. iii. 8. Hof. v. 4. vii. 2. Jer. xxi. 14.

^h Jer. xxi. 12.

“Habits,” therefore, is the true English rendering of the word. For which, in some instances, “manners,” or “practices,” may be used. But some epithet will generally be wanted, in English, to express the ascendancy, and, in the case of evil habits, the malignant ascendancy, implied in the notion of the original word.

(C) ——— the excellency of Israel.” גָּאֹן יִשְׂרָאֵל

From the verb גָּאַנְ, “to rife, swell, grow higher and higher, to be exalted in power, honour, glory,” come three nouns; two masculine, גָּאַח and גָּאַן; and one feminine, גָּאָה, in regimine גָּאֹות. The first גָּאַח sometimes drops the final ח, and makes its plural גָּאָה. It renders the adjective “proud,” or “arrogant,” and in one passage^a the noun substantive “pride,” or “arrogance,” and is used in no other sense, or for no other sort of swelling, than that of pride. The feminine noun substantive גָּאָה (which sometimes drops the ה and becomes גָּאָה) and the masculine גָּאַן express the action of swelling, in all the various ways in which the verb may signify to swell. And they are used with so little discrimination, that two very able critics in the Hebrew language have said, that they knew not what the difference is between them. Both are used for “swelling,” in the literal sense; for an increase in bulk or quantity. They are both applied to the swelling of the sea. The feminine גָּאַח, in Ps. lxxxix. 10. The masculine גָּאַן, in Job xxxviii. 11. And either of them is used to render figurative swellings; excellence in general, in power, rank, wealth, &c. But with this distinction, that the feminine גָּאָה often signifies “pride,” properly so called, as an internal quality and a vice. The masculine גָּאַן is never used for pride, in a bad sense, and as an internal quality; though it has been taken in that sense in this passage, and in many others, by our own translators and other interpreters. But גָּאַן expresses rather condition, or external appearance, than character: great elevation in rank and power; brilliant prosperity; splendor and gaiety of ornamental dress, majesty, pomp, stateliness; any thing in condition, which, in the degenerate mind, may engender pride; any thing in external deportment, which may be a symptom of it; and any thing grand and majestic in outward appearance, without any imputation of pride to the person to whom it belongs. The feminine גָּאַח, besides every thing to which גָּאַן is

^a Prov. viii. 13.

applied,

applied, extends also to the moral internal swellings of the heart, and renders the vice of “pride,” which הָגָג never expresses. In Prov. viii. 13. הָגָג is rendered, in our public translation, “arrogancy.” In Is. xvi. 6. the word occurs twice, and is repeatedly rendered “pride.” But in a parallel passage^a, where the word occurs again twice, our translators first render it by “pride,” and the second time by “arrogancy.” But in every one of these passages הָגָג is joined with the feminine הָגָה which is the proper word for pride. It may signify therefore something, in some way connected with pride, but not pride itself. I would render it “stateliness;” preserving the reference to external deportment or appearance, which I take to be essential to the word. “— pride and state—“lines, and the evil way, and the mouth of inconstancy, I hate^b.” “We have “heard of the stateliness of Moab (he is very proud), of his pride, and his stateli-“ness, and his fury, not in just proportion to his ability^c.” Or, as the passage might be rendered, “We have heard of the stateliness of Moab—extravagantly “proud is his pride. And his stateliness and his fury not in just proportion to his “ability.” In this rendering, the adjective נָגָג, in the second clause of the sentence, is taken as the predicate of הָגָג, and the verb substantive is understood. Again, “We have heard of the stateliness of Moab—his haughtiness is ex-“ceedingly supereminent.—His stateliness also and his pride, and the tower-“ing ambition of his heart^d.” The rendering of the middle clause of this sentence is from Dr. Blaney’s translation; which first suggested to me the translation, which I propose, of the corresponding clause in the parallel passage of Isaiah. הָגָג is taken as a verb, of which נְבָחוּ is the subject. The word הָגָג occurs in Scripture above forty times. But these three are the only passages, in which elevation of rank or power, grandeur and majesty externally displayed, are not more to the purpose of the context, than pride, or any internal affection of the heart. And in these three passages the internal affection is mentioned by its proper name; and stateliness of deportment, as the effect or symptom of the affection, connects well with it.

The words “Pride,” in the English language, and “Superbia,” in the Latin, are sometimes used abusively, to express an affection of the mind not criminal. As “sime superbiam quæsitam meritis.” That satisfaction and com-

^a Jer. xlvi. 29.

^b Prov. viii. 13.

^c Is. xvi. 6.

^d Jer. xlvi. 29.

placency, which we naturally feel in conscious superiority, either in mental endowments, bodily strength, or in rank and condition, is in itself not criminal. It is natural to the mind of man ; and, when it is accompanied with a due sense of thankfulness to God, as to him by whose only gift one man differeth from another, and is not mixed with an arrogant assumption of merit to ourselves, or with contempt of others, it is indeed a virtuous feeling. The word **גָּאֹל** however is never used to express even this honourable inoffensive pride. But, like the words pride and *superbia*, it is often applied to the external thing, which produces this internal affection. In our English Bible, we read in three passages^a of the “swelling of Jordan.” In the original **גָּאֹל הַירּוֹן**. But the swelling of the waters of the Jordan cannot be the thing intended. For, it appears, from a fourth passage^b where the same expression occurs in the original, that this **גָּאֹל הַירּוֹן** was something that might be the subject of devastation ; for, it is said of it, that it “is spoiled.” It could be nothing but the thicket of trees and bushes, which adorned the banks of the river. It is very properly rendered in this place, “the pride of Jordan,” in our public translation, and “superbia Jordanis,” in the Vulgate. It is properly called the pride of Jordan, as an ornament of which the river, could we ascribe to it sense and intelligence, might justly be proud. *Superbia Jordanis* is the rendering of the Vulgate in the three other passages ; and “the pride,” instead of “the swelling of Jordan,” would be the true rendering in English. See Dr. Blaney, upon Zech. xi. 3.

It is now evident, in what sense, and with what propriety, the Temple at Jerusalem, in two passages^c; and God himself, in a third^d, as resident in that Temple, is called, “the excellency of Jacob;” and God himself again, in this passage, “the excellency of Israel.” The Temple, by the magnificence of the structure, the costliness and splendor of its furniture and ornaments, and the pomp and awfulness of the rites performed in it, but, above all, by the tokens of the Divine presence in the sanctuary, was the great ornament of the city of Jerusalem, and the boast and pride of the whole nation. A temple, in which the Glory of Jehovah was visibly displayed, and the immediate communication of God with the Israelites thus manifested, was the circumstance, in their external condition, which raised them above all the nations of the earth ; and this Temple, and this God, ought to have been their pride. But pride being too common and ambiguous a word to be ap-

^a Jer. xii. 5. xlix. 19. l. 44.

^b Zech. xi. 3.

^c Ps. xlvi. 4. Amos vi. 8.

^d Amos viii. 7.

plied

plied to such holy subjects, I adopt the well chosen word of our public translation in another place, “ excellency.”

(D) ——— a month.” **חַדְשָׁה**. The change of **חַדְשָׁה** into **הַחְנֵל** proposed by Houbigant, stands upon the single authority of the LXX (if indeed upon that), unsupported by any MS, and contradicted by Chald. Aquila, Symmachus, Theodotion, St. Jerome, and the Vulgate, who all represent the received reading **חַדְשָׁה**.

(E) ——— rulers. **שָׁרִי**. I prefer the word “ rulers” to “ princes,” by which our public translation here, and in most other places, renders the Hebrew word ; because, in the modern acceptation of the word princes, royalty, or, at least, royal blood, is included in the notion of it. But these **שָׁרִים** of the Old Testament, were not persons of royal extraction, or connected by blood or marriage with the royal family ; but the chief priests and elders, who composed the secular, as well as the ecclesiastical, magistracy of the country.

(F) ——— self-willed, walking after a commandment.” According to the antient versions, “ going after idols.” Instead of the word **אַז** a commandment, it should seem that these antient interpreters read some word signifying idols, and describing them either as vanities, or as objects of contempt and disgust. The versions of the LXX, and the Syr. suggest **אַשְׁוֹשׁ**, “ vanity :” St. Jerome and the Vulg. **אַז**, “ filthy ordure.” Which might also be the reading of Jonathan, who has a rendering of his own, “ —— their judges have “ turned themselves to go a-whoring after the mammon of iniquity.” But as no trace of either of these readings, or of any other variety, appears in any one of the numerous MSS. collated by Kennicott and De Rossi, and the present text gives a striking and apposite meaning ; I have thought it my duty to adhere to it. Declaring, however, that I consider **אַשְׁוֹשׁ**, **אַז**, and **אַז**, as three various readings, each of high authority, among which the learned reader is at full liberty to make his own choice.

(G) ——— a moth in the garment—a worm in the flesh.” — **רַכְבָּה** — **שַׁי**. Rabbi Tanchum, as he is quoted by Dr. Pocock upon this place, says, that **שַׁי** is a worm breeding in clothes, and eating them ; **רַכְבָּה**, a worm breeding in

old rotten wood. But the learned Drusius says of the latter word, that it may be understood of a worm that breeds either in wood, or in the bones. That it signifies some kind of worm, or maggot, I have no doubt. Because the rule of the parallelism demands some gnawing insect, that may correspond with **וֹי**, the moth. But from the effect ascribed to it in the following verse, which is a fore running with corruption, I think it must be understood of a worm, bred indeed within the human body, but eating through the flesh. I have taken the liberty to add the words, “in the garment,” “in the flesh,” to mark the distinction of the species expressed by the two words, and to present the image of the original more adequately to the English reader.

(H) ——— his holes.” **חֲלֵי**, made by the fretting of the moth. I take the word as a noun, from **חַלֵּ**, to perforate, or make a hole of any sort.

(I) ——— his corrupted sore,” **מַרְאֵ**. Or according to many of the best MSS, **מַרְאֵו**. I see no necessity for making **מַר** the root, and going to the Arabic for the sense of it. The noun **מַרְאֵ** comes regularly from the Hebrew root **רַא**, to compress or squeeze, and signifies something that wants squeezing or compressing; and thus a purulent sore, which wants to have the matter squeezed out, or perhaps to be compressed with a bandage; but the first notion I prefer. See Bishop Lowth, upon Isaiah i. 6.

(K) ——— the king who takes up all quarrels,” **רַב**. No proper name either of man or place, but clearly a noun, from the verb **רָוב**, put here in apposition with **מֶלֶךְ**, and characteristic of the King, in the manner expressed in my translation. So Aquila, *δικαιομένον*. Symmachus, St. Jerome, and Vulg. “ultorem.” Theodotion *αριστήν*. **לְמַלְכָא דִּיתִי לְאַתְפָּרָע לְהַחַ**. “—— ad regem “ut adventaret ultum eos.” Jonathan. See Appendix, No. II.

(L) ——— repair the damage ——— make a cure of.” The words, **רָפָא** and **נְגַהָה**, refer respectively to the moth-eaten holes in the garment, and the sore in the flesh. **רָפָא** is property to restore, whatever is damaged, to a sound and whole condition: to repair a decayed or ruined building, to mend a damaged cloth.

CHAP. VI.

(A) —— His coming forth is fixed as the morning.” “Coming forth,” for מִזְמָרָה. 37 MSS. and some of the oldest printed texts give מִזְמָרָה — fixed as the morning,” ὡς ὥρθης βελτία ἡ ἐπιτέλυσις αὐτῆς. Sym.

(B) —— pouring shower.” The word מַזְבֵּחַ is not simply a shower, but a hard pouring shower.

(C) —— harvest rain — rain of seed time,” יְוָרָה — בְּמִלְקָשׁ. Our public translation gives “latter rain — former rain.” But the Hebrew nouns have nothing of “latter” or “former,” implied in their meaning. And the English expressions convey a notion, just the reverse of the truth, to the English reader. For what it calls the latter rain, fell in the spring, which we consider as the former part of the year; and what it calls the former rain, fell about the end of our year, namely, in the autumn. מִלְקָשׁ is literally the “crop-rain.” That which fell just before the season of the harvest, to plump the grain before it was severed. And the beginning of the season of the harvest in Judaea being the middle of March, according to the old style; this rain fell about the beginning of that month, and may properly be called the “Harvest-rain.” The other יְוָרָה, is literally the “springing-rain,” or rather, “the rain which ‘makes to spring’:” that which fell upon the seed, newly sown, and caused the green blade to shoot up out of the ground. This fell about the end or middle of October. I call it the “rain of seed time;” for the springing rain might turn the thoughts of the English reader to the spring. These rains of seed time and harvest are the ὑετὸς ἀραιῆμος καὶ ὥψιμος of St. James^a. But the Apostle’s epithets have reference to the order of the husbandman’s expectations, not to the civil division of the year.

^a V. 7.

(D) ——— piety.” **חִסְדָּה**. The various senses of this word are well enumerated by Vitrunga upon Isaiah xl. 6. But the general radical meaning of the word is by none so well developed, as by Mr. Parkhurst. Exuberance is included in the notion of it, in all its applications. The exuberant kindness of God to man; overflowing piety of man towards God; exuberant kindness of man to man; exuberant pruriency of inordinate lust^a; exuberance of wrath, and of reproachfull language. In its good sense, the word “mercy” is inadequate, in the application of it either to God, or man. As from God to man, exuberant or abundant kindness is in general the best English word. As between man and man, “exceeding kindness.” In many passages in which it is rendered “mercy,” it properly signifies “philanthropy,” displaying itself in a general mildness and gentleness of manners. This is clearly the sense in Prov. xi. 17. and, I think, in many other passages, in which it is not applied to any individual act. As from man to God, “piety,” swelling in the heart, and displaying itself in acts of devotion. In this place, I think, it signifies that sudden flow of piety, which occasionally comes upon men of very loose lives, if they are not wholly lost to all sense of religion; particularly under afflictions, which produce a momentary penitence.

Munster pertinently remarks, that the Jewish nation had its transient fits of reformation, cutting down the groves, killing the priests of Baal; but they soon returned to their abominations.

(E) ——— belaboured by the prophets,” **חִצְבָּתִי בְּנֵי-אִים**. The LXX, and Syr. certainly take the Prophets for the object of the verb **חִצְבָּתִי**. And the prophetic order was indeed deeply implicated in the national guilt: insomuch that many of them were promoters of it; and as such are frequently reproved and threatened by Hosea, and by all the faithfull Prophets that were true to their commission. But I cannot find, that this verb, in any instance, governs its object by the prefix **בְּ**. I take the prefix therefore for the preposition of the instrument; and I take Ephraim and Judah, rehearsed by the suffix **ם**, in the verb **הָרְגָתִים**, for the object of both verbs. And to this Jonathan, St. Jerome, and the Vulgate agree.

^a Lev. xx. 17.

— be-

—— belaboured ;” the image is that of a hewer of wood, laying on heavy strokes, with the axe, upon a piece of hard timber.

(F) ——— the precepts given thee.” So I understand the word משפט. The learned reader will find the various senses, or applications rather, of this word distinctly exhibited by Vitringa, upon Isaiah, vol. II. p. 422. It signifies a fixed principle, or rule, in any thing, to which principle and rule can be applied. Here I take it for the practical rules of a moral and godly life, as delivered by the Prophets ; and so Calvin expounds it : — “ Significat hic “ Deus se regulam piè et sanctè vivendi monstrâsse Israelitum. — *Judicia tua*, “ hoc est ratio piè vivendi.” It is certain indeed that the Syr. and Jonathan redde *וְמִשְׁפְּטֵי כָּאֹר יְצָא*. But none of the MSS give this reading, or any variety ; except that one, of no great authority, has *מִשְׁפְּט* in the singular ; which seems to have been the reading given in St. Jerome’s Septuagint ; though the Septuagint, as we now have it, agrees with the Syr. and Jonathan. But St. Jerome and the Vulgate are with the printed text, though they render it but ill.

(G) —— Charity.” I think, with Calvin, that the word חסד is used here in a comprehensive sense ; signifying both piety towards God, and philanthropy. I can find no single word to answer to it, but Charity. For Charity, in the Evangelical sense, is the love of man founded upon the love of God, and arising out of it.

(H) —— even in these circumstances.” This I take to be the force of the adverb וְ, as it is used here, referring neither to place nor time, but to a state of things. The Latin “ Ibi” might in some degree express it, but we have no one word for it in our language.

(I) The very learned Drusius says, in his notes upon this place, that he once conjectured, that Gilead was put here by a sort of abbreviation for Ramoth Gilead, as Aven is sometimes put for Beth-aven ; but that he abandoned this conjecture, when he found mention, as he thought, in Eusebius of a city called simply Gilead, in the mountainous region of the same name. Then he produces a passage from Eusebius, “ *De Locis Hebraicis*,” as translated and altered by St. Jerome, in which, after a general description of the mountain Galaad, or Gilead, it is said, “ from which mountain a city also, built in it, took its

“ name; which city Gilead the son of Machir, the son of Manasseh, took from the Amorites^a.” It is evident, that, in these words, the author, whether Eusebius himself or St. Jerome, refers to the fact recorded Num. xxxii. 39. 40; and understands the Gilead, which the children of Machir, the son of Manasseh, are there said to have taken from the Amorites, of a city of that name; in which I have no doubt that he is right. But I see no reason to suppose, that this was any other than Ramoth-gilead itself. It is to be observed, that, although it is said, that “ Moses gave Gilead unto Machir, the son of Manasseh, and he dwelt therein;” yet the conqueror of the Amorites in this quarter could not be Machir himself, the son of Manasseh; nor could he dwell in Gilead, or any of his sons; for they must have been dead long before the Exodus. If I might offer a conjecture upon a point, which, from the imperfection of history, is of so much uncertainty; I should say, that Gilead, a grandson probably of the son of Machir of that name, having taken a principal city of the Amorites, in the mountainous country, fortified it for himself, and gave it his own name. That from the city the name passed to the district, which was allotted to that conqueror; and from that district, to the whole of a large tract of mountainous country, which made part of the settlement, not only of the half tribe of Manasseh, but moreover of the tribes of Reuben and Gad. But the name Gilead, having thus been transferred from the city to a country comprehending many cities; the city, for distinction, took the name of Ramoth-Gilead; the word Ramoth probably alluding to the lofty turrets, raised by Gilead for defence against besiegers^b.

(K) —— to Sichem.” In taking שכינה for the name of the city with the local paragogic ה, I am supported by the Syr. LXX, and Symmachus; and by the Vulgate, in taking שכם for the name of the place, though not in the construction of the paragogic ה.

(L) In the original I remove the Soph-pasuk at וְעַד to שָׁרָאֵל, so connecting the two words בְּבֵית יִשְׂרָאֵל with the 9th verse, and making the 10th verse begin with the word רְאֵיתִ. This is the only alteration of the printed text, which I make or admit, in this passage; and this is supported by the version of the LXX^c.

^a “ A quo monte et civitas, in eo condita, fortita est vocabulum; quam et cepit de Amorœorum manu Galaad filius Machir, filii Manasse.”

^b Vide Appendix, No. III.

^c Vide Appendix, No. II.

(M) That

(M) That the harvest in Joel, iii. 13. is the fruit of the vine is confirmed by the versions of Syr. and LXX. and by the use of the word קציר in Is. xvii. 11. where it is used for the ripe fruits of a *grafted plantation* (see bishop Lowth's translation); whence it should seem that, although by its etymology, it most properly signifies corn reaped, mowed, or cut down; yet it is used, as a general word, for the severed fruits of the earth, of whatever kind. And the word קציר by itself being capable of this general meaning, קציר קמה is a specific name for the corn-harvest (Is. xvii. 5.); and קציר חטם a still more specific name for the wheat-harvest.

CHAP. VII.

(A) WHEN I would have healed." כִּרְפָּא. At the very time when I was about to heal. — Dum in eo essem ut sanarem. This is the force of the prefix כ, which would be very ill changed into ב; an alteration for which there is no authority, but that of a single printed edition, not of any MS.

(B) —— carried on — פָּעַל. The verbs עָשָׂה and פָּעַל are not perfectly equivalent. The verb עָשָׂה is simply "to do," or "make," facere, in any manner, without reference to the length of time, degree of labour or thought, necessary to the performance. But the verb פָּעַל is applied to those operations only, which require some continued labour of the hand, or long application of the mind, or both. The thing meant here seems to be the carrying on of a premeditated plot or scheme for the subversion of the true religion, and the establishment of idolatry.

(C) —— let them not say unto their heart, that I have remembered all their doings." To the same effect Aquila; ἢ μήποτε εἴπωσι ταῖς καρδίαις αὐτῶν, παῖσαν νανίαν αὐτῶν ἐμνήσθην. St. Jerome also, the Vulgate, and Abarbanel take the negative בְּ as a prohibitory particle; though neither he, nor St. Jerome, expound the prohibition exactly in the sense expressed in my translation. See Pocock, p. 289.

(D) —— unto their heart.” **לְלִבָּם**. The change of the prefix **לְ** into **בְּ**, though supported by the reading of the Complutensian edition, and seven or eight MSS of Kennicott’s, and seven or eight more of De Rossi’s, would be much for the worse. When a man thinks within himself what he is afraid, or ashamed, or unwilling, to utter aloud, or declare openly; then he speaks *in* his heart: and this is expressed by **בְּ**. But when a man pursues his own thoughts without utterance, but without any desire of concealment; more especially when he soothes and consoles himself with hopes and expectations well or ill founded, when he encourages and incites himself to action; then he speaks *to* his heart. — $\pi\varphi\circ\delta\circ\mu\epsilon\gamma\alpha\lambda\eta\tau\circ\rho\alpha$ Συμόν: and this is expressed by **לְ**:

(E) —— their perfidies.” I think the word **כְּחֵשֶׁב**, as a noun-substantive, renders not so properly “a lie,” in the sense of a false assertion, as a “failure” in the truth of a promise or engagement; a failure in any point of duty, or natural obligation; in particular, in loyalty to the rightfull sovereign, and above all to the Sovereign of sovereigns.

(F) —— the stoker.” **מְעַזֵּב**, a noun-substantive, regularly formed from the Hiphil of the verb **מָעַזֵּב**. Excitator. The man whose busness it is to stir up the fire in the oven. This I take as the nominative case of the verb **מְעַזֵּב**.

(G) —— untill the fermentation of it be complete. All this I take to be expressed in the words **עַד חַמְצָתָן**. And St. Jerome’s rendering, which is also that of the Vulgate, is to the same amount —— donec fermentaretur totum.” The noun **חַמְצָתָן** properly renders the act, or passion rather, of fermentation; the being fermented.

(H) An oven, in which the fire is raised to such a pitch, as to continue burning fiercely for a long time, by its own internal fury, when no further means are used to stir it up; in which the heat is so intense, as to be too strong for the baker’s purpose, insomuch that it must be suffered to abate, before the bread can be set in; is certainly a most apt and striking image of the heart of the sensualist, inflamed with appetite, by repeated and excessive indulgence so wrought into the ordinary habit and constitution of the man, that it rages by the mere lust of the corrupted imagination, even in the absence of the external objects

objects of desire, that might naturally excite it; and works itself up to an excess, which is even contrary to the purpose; for which the animal appetites are implanted; in such sort disordering the corporeal frame, that till the passion has spent itself in a great degree, it is incapable of enjoying its proper object.

To apply the images severally, I take the Oven to be the heart: the burning fire, the animal appetites in act: the stoker, or fire-stirrer, the external objects of desire, considered as present to the senses, and exciting the appetites. The dough, the sensitive animal frame, or nervous system, considered as the proper object of the immediate action of appetite: the baker, who ought to manage the oven, regulate the heat, superintend the stoker, and conduct every thing aright for the baking of the bread, is reason or intellect; which ought to be the governing faculty in the human soul. The fire always gets a-head, when this baker takes too long a sleep. As in the 6th verse.

The sensuality however here is that, of which sensuality is the constant scriptural type, the absurd and wicked passion for idolatry.

(I) ——— our king." מלכנו. I think there is irrisio in the suffix. "This rare king of ours."

(K) ——— to scorners." So the Bishop's Bible, and the English Geneva. And to the same effect Calvin. ——— *extendit manum suam ad illusores.*" "Dicit regem manum suam protractasse illusoribus; nempe in signum societatis." Instances of the use of the particle **את** in the sense of the Latin *ad*, or, which would come to the same thing here, as a sign of the dative case, are to be found in Noldius. Perhaps the passages cited by him are not all to the purpose; but some among them seem decisive.

(L) Truly, in the inmost part of it, their heart is like an oven." I take [the order of construction thus: **כִּי לְבָם קָרְבָּו** **הִיא** **כְּתָנוֹר**. I take the suffix **ם** in the word **קָרְבָּו**; as rehearsing the noun **לֵב**; which I understand as the nominative case of the verb substantive understood: and thus I bring out the sense, which I have given in my translation.

(M) ——— put themselves in a stir about corn and wine." In the Hebrew I place the Soph pasuk at the word **יִתְנוֹרְרוּ**, in the 14th verse; and I make the

the 15th begin with the word יִסְרֹוּ. Then at the word בַּי (the second word of the 15th verse, according to this division), I place Rebhia; and at סְרֹתִי, Athnach: Rebhia again at וְרוּתָם; and the Soph pasuk at רַע I leave undisturbed. These corrections of the stops are the only alterations I make in the printed text.

— put themselves in a stir.” יִתְנַדְּרוּ. This can be nothing but the third person plural of the future in Hithpael of the verb גָּוֹר. There are four distinct roots, גָּר, גָּרָה, גָּרָר, גָּרָד, each of which has its proper signification. גָּר, “to fear, to be in consternation.” גָּוֹר, to “sojourn,” as a foreigner. גָּרָה, “to excite or stir up,” particularly war or strife; or, neutrally, “to be in a stir.” גָּרָד, “to saw.” גָּרָר is evidently the leading word; but all the four, especially the three first, have an intercommunity of secondary senses. גָּוֹר, in a secondary sense, takes the sense of גָּרָה, “to fear;” and, in another secondary sense, agrees with גָּרָה, “to be in a stir.” Even the fourth גָּרָד, “to saw,” seems not entirely unconnected with גָּרָה, “to excite;” for the first effect of sawing is the excitation of small light dust, that flies about in the air, and is in perpetual stir. The Lexicons, among the senses of גָּוֹר, give “to assemble,” or “collect.” But I agree with the learned Mr. Parkhurst, that this sense belongs not to this root, nor to any one of the four roots; and where the Hithpael is rendered in our public translation, as in this place, of “persons assembling themselves,” it is to be understood of “putting themselves in a vehement stir, or commotion.” טָרַר מַתְנֹר, in Jer. xxx. 23. is “a whirlwind stirring itself up.”

(N) —— turned against me.” יִסְרֹוּ. From the root סְרֹר, not from סְרֹר, which forms the third pers. pl. fut. יִסְרֹר.

(O) They fall back into nothingness of condition.” שׁוּבוּ לֹא עַל. For the elucidation of these difficult words, I observe, first, that the verb שׁוּב signifies either “to return,” or “to turn away from,” or “to turn towards.” But properly and most frequently “to return,” in reference to a former place, or condition. 2. In the sense of returning, or of turning towards, it usually governs the place to which, by the detached preposition אֶל, or the prefix לְ. But either of these may be omitted; and the verb will appear as a verb transitive, governing

verning the place, or condition, “to which,” as its object, without a preposition; like some verbs of motion, in particular connections, in the Latin language. Urbem adii. Domum redii. Romam prosectus sum. This construction, in the Hebrew language, is very rare; but this passage is one clear instance of it. For **לְאֵלָה** (whatever it may mean) stands as the place “to which,” and as the accusative after the verb transitive **שָׁבָשׁ**; and it is by no means necessary to correct the text by conjecture, with the learned Houbigant, to supply the supposed omission of the prefix. Although, if any emendation were necessary, his conjecture, **לְאֵלָה** for **לְאָה**, might seem very plausible.

II. The word **לָהּ** has been very differently taken by different interpreters; whose various opinions are stated at length, by the learned Pocock upon the place. I consider none of them as deserving of attention, but those which attempt to ascertain the meaning of the word as it stands, without the aid of conjectural emendation. And these all take the word in one or other of three different ways: 1. As a noun adjective. 2. As a noun substantive. 3. As an adverb. But, whichever way it is to be taken, **לָהּ** is something described by privation of the thing signified by **לָהּ**, whatever that may be.

1. As a noun adjective, the word **לָהּ** is supposed to be an epithet of God, describing him as the High one, or the Highest. The learned Drusius, who adopts this sense, thinks the word an abridgement of **עַלְיָה** by apocope. And for this he may have the authority of some learned Rabbin. Nevertheless, I scruple not to deny, that a single instance of a similar apocope is to be found in the Hebrew language. The word **לָהּ** is no such instance, by apocope from **אֱלֹהִים**; for **לָהּ** and **אֱלֹהָה** are two distinct roots. The word **הַ** is no such instance, by apocope from **יְהֹוָה**: for the latter is a compound of the former, with the Benoni of another root. Nor is any unexceptionable instance to be found, in which the word **לָהּ** is used as an adjective rendering “High.” This interpretation, therefore, though it is adopted by our English translators, being rejected, as founded on an irregular formation of the noun, and an unexampled sense of the noun so formed; it remains, that the word **לָהּ** must be either a noun substantive, or an adverb. As a noun substantive it may render either “a yoke,” or “height;” as an adverb, “on high,” *sursum*. The Vulgate takes it in the sense of “a yoke,” understanding, figuratively, “the yoke of “the Mosaic law.” For the rendering of the Vulgate is, “Reversi sunt, ut

“essent.”

“ effent absque jugo.” Which is well expounded by Grotius, “ Denuo vo-
“ luerunt esse absque jugo. Per jugum intelligenda lex.” Symmachus, and
the 6th Greek, render to the same effect. $\alpha\nu\sigma\sigma\epsilon\varphi\alpha\nu\; eis\; t\bar{o}\; \mu\bar{n}\; \bar{e}xei\bar{n}\; \zeta\bar{u}y\bar{o}\bar{n}$. Sym.
 $\alpha\nu\sigma\sigma\eta\tau\alpha\nu\; i\nu\alpha\; \deltai\bar{a}y\bar{a}w\sigma\alpha\nu\; a\nu\bar{n}\nu\; \zeta\bar{u}y\bar{g}$. E. This sense the Hebrew words will certainly
bear; and of all that have been proposed it seems the best sense, next after
that which I have given in my translation; which is R. Tanclum’s, and, in my
judgement, the best of all.

According to this interpretation, **לָ** is taken either as a noun substantive, rendering “height;” or, as an adverb, rendering “on high;” and it is not material, which way it be taken. For if it be an adverb, still **לָ** **אַל** stands as a noun, after the verb **שָׁבָ**, and expresses that which is the privation of height. But the height, whether expressed by the noun, or by the adverb, is to be understood figuratively, of height of rank or condition. In which sense the adverb is used, 2 Sam. xxiii. 1. **הַנְּבֵרֶךְ עַל**. “The man who was settled in a high degree;” i. e. established on the throne of Judah, which was made the inheritance of his family in perpetuity, and raised, in his own person, to be the type of his great descendant. The Israelites also were placed in a high degree, to be worshippers of the true God; which high degree they relinquished by their defection to idolatry, and returned to the low level of the heathen^a. The versions of the LXX, and the Syriac, rightly understood, convey the same meaning, and give it in words exactly equivalent to those which I have used. **απεξεράη εἰς οὐδέν.** LXX. **وَلَمْ يَلْعَمْ** Syr. “Obliquârunt se ad nihilum;” not, as the Polyglott translation gives it, “nullâ de causâ.” We say, in common speech, of a man, who, by misconduct, has lost all esteem and credit in the world, “He has brought himself to nothing.”

³ See R. Tanchum ap. Pocock.

CHAP. VIII.

(A) THE cornet at thy mouth, &c." To this effect the Vulgate; with Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion according to St. Jerome.

In gutture tuo sit tuba, quasi aquila, &c." Quæ tam latè audiatur, quam aquila templum supervolitans, & è sublimi crocitans. *Grotius.*

(B) I place the Soph-pasuk at דענוּך. "O my God"—Israel, speaking collectively, uses the singular pronoun and the plural verb.

(C) —— of themselves." Sponte. This I take to be the force of the pronoun מֵה. See v. 9.

(D) —— have antipathy." This is the true sense of the phrase נָא יְכַל. See Ps. ci. 5. If. i. 13. and compare Amos vii. 10.

(E) —— pure religion." For פָּנָן, the Complutensian, and four other printed texts, with 44 MSS, among them some of the very oldest and best, give פָּנָן; which is certainly the true form of the word. It signifies purity, or cleanliness, generally. Hence moral purity, innocence. But here, I think, it particularly denotes "pure religion," or the purity of worship. "Pure religion, and undefiled," in opposition both to the superstitious practices of idolaters, and the false shew of hypocrites.

(F) —— even this." נָאַתָּה. The נ is highly emphatical, aggravating the accusation. Even a thing so abominable, as this, was his own invention. Archbishop Newcome says, "The Israelites may have originally borrowed this "superstition from the Egyptians;" for, in Egypt, he observes, "this species "of animals were worshipped; the Apis at Memphis, and the Mnevis at He- "liopolis." But the Prophet says expressly, not indeed in the learned Pri-

mate's amended text, and mis-translation; but, in his own words, he says expressly, that the Israelites borrowed this superstition from nobody. It was all their own. Indeed, what they had seen in Egypt was the worship of a living calf; not of the lifeless image of a calf, or of any other animal.

(G) ——— reduced to atoms." **שְׁבָבִים דֵּין** Sebab est minimum quidque in re quavis; ut scintilla, fragmenta, segmenta. Grotius ad locum.

(H) "To sow the wind, and reap the whirlwind," may certainly be a proverbial expression for measures of bad policy, ending in ruin, and disappointing the statesman's expectations. But instead of taking the verbs **יקְרַעוּ** and **יקְרַרְוּ** as plurals, of which the plural pronoun of the third person understood, rehearsing Israel collectively, is the subject; I take the verbs in the singular number, and the final **וּ** as the affixed pronoun of the third person singular, rehearsing Israel: and the nouns **רוֹת** and **סּוֹפְתָה** I take as the subjects of those verbs respectively. And thus I bring out the sense expressed in my translation. The only objection I am aware of is, that the feminine nouns, **רוֹת** and **סּוֹפְתָה**, are taken as the subjects of verbs masculine. But of these two nouns, the former is often masculine. And the anomaly of gender between verbs and nouns, especially when the noun is the name of a thing, which hath not naturally the one sex or the other, is so frequent, that **רוֹת** is sometimes both masculine and feminine in the same sentence. It is somewhat in favour of my interpretation, that for five MSS give **יקְרַרְוּ**; in which form the verb must be singular, and the final **וּ** must be the affixed pronoun. For the third person pl. præt. admits not the epenthetic **וּ**. It is true, that in Exodus xviii. 26. we read, in the printed texts, **ישְׁפַטוּ**. But upon this Buxtorf observes, "Unum reperitur cum Schu-
"rek præter morem." And 15 MSS, and the Samaritan text, give **ישְׁפַטוּ** in the regular form, without the epenthetic **וּ**.

(I) ——— of their own accord." This I take to be the force of the pronoun **הַמָּה**. And this is generally its force, where it appears, as in this place, pleonastic. See v. 4. and chap. ix. 10.

(K) ——— will I embody them.” **אִקְבָּצֶם**. The verb קָבַץ signifies to collect, into one mass, things naturally separate and dispersed. Hence more particularly, to form or assemble armies. The use of the verb in this sense, in the historical books of Scripture, is very frequent. In Is. lvii. 13. the noun **קָבָצִים** renders “thy companies,” i. e. “companies of soldiers.” I take the verb here therefore as a military term; and, considering how it stands connected with the verb יִתְנַשֵּׁא, I think that verb is to be taken as a military term too; the former rendering the embodying of armies, the latter the granting of bounties to the persons enlisting, or of tribute to foreign princes furnishing auxiliaries. Thus God threatens, that he will press, into his own armies against the Israelites, those very bands of foreign mercenaries, whom the Israelites themselves, to the great mortification of the King and the rulers, when the error of the measure appeared by the event, had paid at a dear rate.

I find, I have the concurrence of the learned Noldius in this interpretation of the passage; as far at least as the general meaning is concerned. “ **Sen-sus est, quamvis mercede conducant gentes in auxilium, ego tamen mox contra eos illas ipsas colligam. Scil. brevi futuras ex amicis hostes.**” Nold. Concordant. Partic. Annot. 1031.

(L) ——— and the rulers.” The reading of שָׁרִים for שָׁרִים is supported by such a weight of authority, that I cannot but adopt it. Eight MSS of Kennicott’s; nine of De Rossi’s; two more of Kennicott’s originally; six more of De Rossi’s originally; the notes of the printed Bible Minchath Shai^a; the Babylonian Talmud; LXX; Syr. Chald. Aq. Theod. St. Jerome, Vulg. And yet there is no difficulty in the construction of the common text. For it might be thus rendered, “ And ere long the rulers shall sorrow for the burthen of the King,” i. e. for the burthen imposed by the King in taxes.

(M) I punctuate the original thus. Over the first מִזְבְּחוֹת, in verse 11, I place Rebhia, or the semicolon; and at the second מִזְבְּחוֹת, in the same verse, I place the Soph-pasuk: that the second לְחַטָּאת may be thrust forward into the subsequent verse, where it stands as the object of the verb transitive; ex-

^a For an account of this Bible, see De Rossi, Prolegom. part I. §. 37, 38.

pressing what God will write, or inscribe, upon Israel; namely, that he is the property of Sin. Inutram ei notas, “ Peccati mastigia.”

A similar allusion, though with a different application, to an owner’s, or commander’s mark impressed upon the person, occurs If. xliv. 5. in nearly the same phrases.

“ One shall say, I am Jehovah’s;
 “ And another shall be called by the name of Jacob;
 וְהַיְכַתֵּב יְהוָה לְיַהוָה
 “ And another shall inscribe his hand, JEHOVAH’S,
 “ And surname himself by the name of Israel.

— JEHOVAH’s, this is what he will write upon his hand: as “ SIN’s,” is what God in Hosea threatens to write upon Ephraim’s person. The only difference in the phraseology of the two Prophets is this: the verb כתַב governs the thing written upon, in Isaiah in the accusative; in Hosea, by the prefix הַ. The prefix הַ in the word written, לְיַהוָה in Isaiah, לְחַטָּאת in Hosea, is the sign of the genitive of the possessor.

“ — an allusion,” says Bishop Lowth, upon Isaiah, “ to the marks which were made by punctures rendered indelible by fire, or by staining, upon the hand, or some other part of the body, signifying the state or character of the person, and to whom he belonged. The slave was marked with the name of his master; the soldier, of his commander; and the idolater, with the name or ensign of his God.” Dean Spencer observes, that, among the heathen, slaves were usually marked in the forehead; soldiers, in the hand. And he thinks, that slaves were usually marked in the hand among the Jews. The mark of the idol was impressed on different parts of the body^a. We have allusion to this custom, in Rev. iii. 12. xiii. 16. xiv. 1. In the primitive ages, it was usual for Christians to mark themselves, upon the wrist or arm, with the name of Christ, or with the sign of the cross: as Spencer and Lowth shew from Procopius upon this passage of Isaiah. Τὸ δὲ τῇ χειρὶ λέγει, διὰ τὸ σίγεν
 ἵσως πολλὰς, ἵπται καρπῶν ἡ βραχιόνων, ἡ τῇ σαυρῷ τὸ σημεῖον, ἡ τὴν Χριστὸν αρροστηγορίαν.

^a See Spencer De Leg. Hebr. lib. II. c. 14. §. 1. and 4.

(N) The masters ——.” For I רבו I read with the marginal varieties of the Venice Bible of 1518, with the marginal Keri of Vander Hooght, and with 13 MSS. רבּי.

(O) —— my proper offerings.” One can only guess at the precise sense of the unusual word **הַבְּהִבִּי**, which, with the majority of interpreters, I take to be the plural of a noun substantive, **הַבְּהָבָבָה**, from the root **יָבַב**, with the pronoun of the first person singular affixed, but blended by cerasis with the iod plural. I think it renders those offerings, which were so appropriate to God, so demanded, as it were, by God as his exclusive property, that the whole was to be burnt upon the altar, and even the priests were not to taste it. And thus the word seems to have been taken by Livelye and Drusius. The accusation is, that the priests, the sacrificers of these offerings, sacrificed, and ate; an act of the highest sacrilege.—“ The sacrificers of my proper offerings;” זְבָח, I take for the particle Benoni plural, in regimine, signifying persons offering sacrifices. It is so used in 18 places besides this.

CHAP. IX.

(A) —— with joyous exultation,” אל נִיל, *exultationem usque*. **נִיל** is a noun substantive, signifying, “ leaping and dancing for joy,” after the preposition **לְ**; not, as some have taken the word, the imperative Hiphil of the verb **לָל** constructed with the prohibitory particle **לֹא**. For it is contrary to the invariable rule of the Hebrew language, that the imperative mood should prohibit. Or, in other words, the prohibitory particle must be constructed with a future tense, never with an imperative mood. Compare Job iii. 22.

(B) —— fee of prostitution,” **אַחֲנָן**. At this word I place the Soph-pasuk.

(C)

(C) ——— must,” **תירוש**. The word often signifies “new wine;” but its primary and proper meaning seems to be “must in the vat,” under the process of fermentation. When this process miscarries, the must never turns to a sound wine. And this seems to be threatened here.

(D) ——— their.” For the singular **בָּת**, the marginal varieties of the Venice Bible of 1518, the Bible of Hale 1720, the notes of the Bible Minchath Shai, the Bible of Pesaro 1517, seventeen MSS of Kennicott’s (among them the oldest and the best), and three more originally, eight of De Rossi’s, and nine more originally, give the plural **בָּתִים**.

(E) ——— their sacrifices are not pleasant to him.” I take away the Zakeph-katon from **בָּת**, and instead of it place Rebbia at **צְבָחָתָם**, taking that noun as the nominative of the verb **עָרַבָּנָה**. Dr. Wheeler adopted the same punctuation.

Our public translation, with many others, makes this 4th verse predictive of the condition of the Israelites in captivity; when they should be deprived of the means and opportunity of making offerings to Jehovah, according to the prescribed rules of the Mosaic ritual. According to the construction which I adopt, it is a description of the enormity of their idolatrous practices, in their own land, previous to their captivity, which brought down upon them that judgement. And with this interpretation stands the authority of Kimchi, the LXX, Capito and Ecolampadius as quoted by Pocock, Calvin, Zanchius, and the learned Drusius. In the general sense of the passage all these interpreters agree; with some difference however among them in the grammatical construction of the words. That, which I adopt, is approved by Kimchi, and the critical Drusius.

(F) ——— as the meat of mourners,” **כְּלָחָם אֹנוֹם**. The noun **עָנוֹם**, and the verb **עָנוֹה**, are distinct roots in the Hebrew language. And from the verb descends another noun, differing in sense as well as in etymology, but expressed by the same letters, as the former. The Masoretes have endeavoured to distinguish the two nouns by giving them different points, which would make the radical noun sound “awven;” the derivative from the verb, “owp.”

“own.” Nevertheless, they have perpetually confounded the two, applying to the one the points, which, in their system, belong to the other.

The radical noun אָוֶן, in the Masoretic pronunciation “Awven,” signifies “activity,” or strength and vigour, in actual exertion; and specifically the generative strength and vigour of the male. And this sense of activity acting, I take to be the proper and primary meaning of the word. In one place I think it is used to denote “adult vigour,” in opposition to the weakness of infancy^a. In the plural number, it is sometimes used to express intensity, or abundance of active vigour; and once, I think, for the rapid motions and efficacious influences of the heavenly bodies^b. “Lift up your eyes “on high, and behold! Who hath created these? [namely, the heavenly “bodies.] He that leadeth forth their host by number, calleth every one of “them by name. Made abundant in active powers [מְרֻב אָוֶןִים], and firm in “strength, not one faileth.” It occurs in the plural once as a noun-adjective, signifying persons endowed with strength, power, and activity, for great enterprizes. “When a wicked man dieth, his expectation shall perish, and the “hope of the active [זָהָלָת אָוֶןִים] perisheth^c.” The noun here renders the Latin “impigri ad labores;” and describes those, who have been the most active, and with the best success, in arduous enterprises; never backward to encounter toil or difficulty.

From this primary sense of active strength, and specifically the generative vigour of the male, this noun became a name or title of the Sun; incessantly active in the constancy and rapidity of the apparent diurnal and annual motions (rejoicing as a Giant to run his course), in the perpetual propagation of light and heat to the utmost limits of the universe, and in his genial influences on all nature, as the first physical principle of fecundity in the animal, vegetable, and mineral kingdoms. These physical powers, which properly indeed belong to the Sun, as an instrument in the hand of God; the antient idolaters ascribed to that luminary, as inherent in itself, independent of the Creator; for they made it self-existent. *Αὐτοφυής*^d. By its influences on nature, they made it the author of all good to the good, and of all evil to the bad. At last they ascribed to it intelligence and will; at least they spoke of it as intelligent, and made it the sovereign of the moral, as well as of the material world.

^a Hos. xii. 4.

^b Is. xl. 26.

^c Prov. xi. 7.

^d Orph. H. V. lin. 3.

Thefe

These various powers are distinctly expressed in the epithets, ascribed to the Sun in the Orphic invocation :

Αὐτορυῆς, ἀκάμα, ——————

Κρᾶσιν ἔχων ὥρῶν

Εὔδρομε, ῥοιζωτήρ —————— διφρεύδα

Ρόμες οἰπειρεσίας δινεύμασιν σίμον ἐλαῖνων,

Εὐσείσι καθοδηγὲ καλῶν, ζαμενῆς οἰσεῖσι:

Κοσμοκράτωρ, ——————

Φερεστειε, κοίρπιμε, τωαιάν.

Δεῖητα δικαιοσύνης

δέσποια κόσμος,

Πισοφύλαξ

"Ομμα δικαιοσύνης, ζωῆς φῶς.

Orph. H. V.

The noun **ῬΝ**, as generally denoting activity, but more particularly the activity of the fecundating principle, comprehends almost every thing that is expressed by these separate epithets, except intelligence and self-existence, and was perhaps the oldest name of the sun as an object of worship. Being once used as a title of the sun, it became the name perhaps of any image or emblem of the sun, placed in the idolatrous temples; and was afterwards more largely used among the Israelites as the name of any idol-image. Thus it is understood in Is. lxvi. 3; at least so it is taken by Jer. and Vulg.; though nothing hinders but that it may be used, even in that place, as an appropriate name of some idol-image of the sun: for the worship of the sun was a very principal part of the idolatry of the Israelites, both long before, and long after, the times of the prophet Isaiah².

From this use of the word, as a name for idol-images of the sun, it naturally acquired the sense of sun worship in particular; and thence, of idolatrous wor-

² See 2 Chron. xiv. 5. 2 Kings, xxiii. 5. and 2 Chron. xxxiv. 4.

ship in general. And then its meaning was extended to signify any thing in thought, word, or deed, contrary to true religion and the positive commands of God. And this accounts for the various senses of iniquity, unrighteousness, ἀδίκια, ἀνομία, κακία, τὸ ἀτοποῦ, μάταια, τυρπία, in which it is rendered by interpreters in various places; in the far greater part of which, however, the original word seems used with reference, more or less obvious, to idolatry, as the cardinal vice.

It once, and I think only once, signifies “Vanity,” in the sense of “Falsehood,”^a and that in the specific instance of the false responses of the oracles of the idols^b. In some other passages, in which it is rendered “vanity,” it is either confounded with the other word, rendering affliction, or may be taken in its common meaning of iniquity.

Falsehood is so nearly allied to “non-entity,” that it is not surprizing, that the word should be found in this sense in Amos v. 5. וּבֵית אֱלֹהִים לֹאֵן — — and Bethel shall come to nought.” קְרַבְתָּ בָּethָלָה וְאֵן בָּethָלָה. LXX. וְרַפְלָחָן לְטֻוֹתָא בְּבִיתָא לְהַזְּלָמָא. Jonathan.

טַוְתָּא לְבָזָבָן לְבָזָבָן. Syr. — et Bethel erit inutilis.

Vulg. This is certainly the only passage, in which the word וְאֵן signifies non-entity, or, nothing. And were it not for the consent of all these antient versions with the Masoretic punctuation; another sense, with an alteration of the points, might be admitted here, which will be mentioned in the sequel.

Whether this word ever renders “wealth,” or “worldly substance,” may deserve consideration. From its primary sense of “activity,” it might naturally be applied to the acquisitions of activity. But unexceptionable examples of this application seem to be wanting.

As the noun וְאֵן, in the sense of idolatry, or iniquity, in the singular number never signifies a single individual act, a sin, or a crime, but denotes the general sinfullness, iniquity, or idolatry of the character; it is never used in the plural number to denote a multitude of such single acts: “Idolatries, sins,

^a Zech. x. 2.

^b “ As וְאֵן or וְאֵל, by being a word for what made man fall, became a root for “ iniquity; ” so by this the principal object in the system [i. e. the system of the visible universe] being worshipped, perhaps it [the name of that principal object] became a root for “ falsity.”

Mr. Hutchinson, *On the Names of the Trinity of the Gentiles.* Tit. בְּנֵי אֵין.

“ iniquities.” It occurs, indeed, in the plural only in four places^a. And, in every one of these places, it is confounded by the Masoretes with the other noun (own). But, in the last of the four^b, it is used in its proper sense of animal strength and vigour. “ He giveth strength to the saint, וְלֹאֵן אָוִינִים, and “ to him that is nothing in vigour he increaseth force.” In the second^c, it signifies vigour of procreation: and in both places the plural is used, only to give intensity to the sense. In the third^d, it denotes the incessant activity of the heavenly bodies, in their rapid motions and physical influences, as hath been already declared: and in the first^e, it is a noun adjective, in apposition with בְּשָׂרָם understood, and is rendered, in our public translation, “ unjust men;” but rather signifies, as hath been shewn, “ active men,” “ bustlers.” This text is rendered in a singular manner by the learned Mr. Parkhurst, in his Lexicon (after Schultens, I believe), “ And his lingering hope shall miserably perish. He takes the plural אָוִינִים adverbially, “ dolorificis modis.” But there seems to be no reason to resort, in this text, to an unexampled use of the word.

Upon the whole it appears, that אָוִינִים, in the passage of Hosea under consideration, cannot be taken as the plural of the radical noun עָוֵן (awven); since no sense of that word, authorized by the usage of the sacred writers, is applicable in this place.

The verb עָנָה has two senses, remotely, if at all, connected with each other. I. To occur, happen, to befall, betide. II. To mourn, lament, grieve.

Some, instead of giving the root עָנָה these two senses, make two different roots; עָנָה, to occur; and עָנָן, to grieve, or mourn. But from עָנָה, which Calasio makes the single root, the verb עָנָן, which occurs only in the Hithpael conjugation, may be formed; as לְלַה from לְלָה.

From this root, עָנָה, therefore, in its second sense, or from עָנָן, if that be a distinct root, comes the noun substantive עָוֵן (own, in the Masoretic pronunciation), rendering what occasions mourning, lamentation, or grief; namely, “ pain of body;” or “ a condition of calamity and affliction.” It is used for “ bodily pain,” in Gen. xxxv. 18. where it denotes the excruciating pains of laborious parturition. It is used for grief, or mourning for the dead;

^a Prov. xi. 7. Ps. lxxviii. 51. If. xl. 26. If. xl. 29.

^c Ps. lxxviii. 51.

^d If. xl. 26.

^b If. xl. 29.

^e Prov. xi. 7.

in Deut. xxvi. 14. It is used for a state of misery or affliction, in Prov. xxii. 8. “He, that soweth evil, shall reap misery.” And it signifies calamity, misery, or tribulation, wherever it is connected, by the copula, with the noun **הַמִּזְבֵּחַ**. In the phrase **הַמִּזְבֵּחַ נָא**, **נָא** is always to be taken as this derivative noun, not as the radical. For though in many passages either might suit the context; yet in some, the radical noun will give no good meaning: whereas there is not one, in which this derivative, in the sense of misery or affliction, is not applicable. In Amos v. 5. **נָא** might be taken as this derivative noun in the sense of tribulation. So Calvin takes it. “Bethel erit in molestiam,” i. e. Bethel is doomed to tribulation; or Bethel shall be a cause of tribulation. But the consent of the antient versions with one another, and with the Masoretic punctuation, in the sense of “nought,” or “non-entity,” seems decisive, that the **נָא** of this place of Amos is the radical noun. Were it not for the deference due to antient authority, Calvin’s exposition of the word, which takes it for the derivative, would be greatly to be preferred.

It may seem perhaps an objection to this analysis of the meaning of the two nouns, the radical and the derivative, that the name of the Sun has been generally supposed to have been **Own**, not **Awven**. That it is to be referred, therefore, to the derivative, not to the radical word; and cannot have been, as I suppose, the origin of that sense of the latter, by which it renders idolatry, and iniquity. I know not, that this opinion has been taken up, on any better authority, than that of the Masoretic punctuation. We read twice in Genesis^a, of a “Priest of **Own**,” according to the points. But the versions of the LXX and the Vulg. in these places are so paraphrastic, that no conclusion can be drawn from them, concerning the pronunciation of the name. From the Syriac it should seem, that it was **Awven** or **Ovan**; much nearer to **Awven**, than to **Own**. But however that may be, I contend only, that the two words, the same in the letters, are distinct in their etymology, and in their meaning. That the Masoretes meant to mark this distinction by their points. But I maintain, that if the two words were differently sounded, according to their different meanings, the Masoretes have perpetually confounded them; and in many places have given **Awven**, when they should have given **Own**, and **Own** when they should have given **Awven**; and thus have brought obscurity upon

^a xli. 45. and 50. and xlvi. 20.

the meaning of the words, and have perplexed the texts, in which they occur. And the name of the Sun is one instance, in which they have mis-pointed. But this is immaterial to my argument; which rests not on any supposed accuracy of the Masoretic points, or the truth of the pronunciation they represent. On the contrary, I impeach both. The name of the Sun, rightly sounded, may have been Own, or it may have been Awven. The sound of the two words may have been, in all cases, the same; always Awven, or always Own, or always something else; and yet the words might be different in etymology and sense. As in Greek, *ἀρεός*, “the sky,” and *ἀρεός*, “the palate.” In Latin, *malum*, “evil,” and *malum*, “an apple.” In English, “a hop,” a certain motion of the body, and “hop,” the flower of a certain plant. “Born,” carried, and “born,” *partu editus*. Without deciding whether the pronunciation of the two Hebrew nouns were the same or different, or what was the true sound of either; I maintain only the distinction between the two, in sense and etymology; and I use the different sounds, “Awven,” and “Own,” only as received marks of that distinction, often confounded.

In two passages the word פָּנָן has been taken in the sense of “goods,” or “substance.” “His children shall seek to please the poor, אָנוֹן וַיַּדְיָו תְּשִׁבְנָה; and his hands shall restore their goods^a.” And, “I have found me out sub-stance^b.” But it must be the radical noun, if either, not this derivative, that can render “goods,” or “substance.” And if these passages are thus rightly rendered, the word in both texts is mis-pointed by the Masoretes. In the text of Job, it is at any rate mis-pointed; for no sense of the derivative noun is applicable there; and the radical is capable of its usual meaning: for the passage may be rendered, “His children shall make their court to the poor, and his own hands shall recompense his iniquity.” See Scot’s version of the Book of Job, and the notes. The text of Hosea will be considered in its place.

The derivative word פָּנָן never occurs in the plural, in the sense of griefs, afflictions, calamities, mournings, or indeed in any sense at all. For the plural פָּנוּן is found only in the four passages quoted above; and, in every one of those, it is the plural of the radical noun, though otherwise pointed by the Masoretes.

^a Job xx. 10.

^b Hosea xii. 8.

Hence

Hence it follows, that the word אֲנִים, in this text of Hosea, is not the plural of the derivative noun נֶשֶׁת, rendering “mournings.” And it has been shewn, that it cannot be the plural of the radical noun ; which would give no meaning here. It remains, therefore, that it is the participle Benoni in Kal of the verb אָנָה, regularly formed, according to the rule of conjugation of the verbs quiescent Lamed ה ; rendering “*lugentes*, persons who are mourning, or “mourners.”

This being settled, it is not difficult to understand, what is meant by the “meat of mourners.” The external expressions of grief for the dead, the rites of mourning, and the ceremonies of interment, seem to have been much the same among the Jews, as were practised by the Heathen ; even in some particulars which were expressly forbidden by the Mosaic law : insomuch, that practices, in many things, contrary to the law, seem to have obtained even among those, who cannot be suspected of giving in to any thing, that was understood, in their own times, to be idolatrous. How it came to pass, that the Divine Law, in these instances, gave way to fashion and custom ; it is difficult to explain. But the fact seems indisputably proved by Jer. xvi. 5—8. For the expressions of grief and mourning for his countrymen, dying of grievous deaths, and consumed by the sword and by famine^a, forbidden to the Prophet, seem to be such, as it is supposed the Holy Prophet would have used, had he not been so forbidden. And they seem to be forbidden, not as things generally sinfull, but improper upon that particular occasion. And yet many of them were certainly contrary to the provisions of the law. It is very remarkable, that some of the same things were prohibited by the Decemviral Law, and yet continued in practice among the Romans. “*Mulieres genas ne radunto, neve lessum funeris ergo habento.*” Was it that the prohibition among the Jews, as well as the Romans, was founded on political, rather than religious, considerations ; so that though the Civil Law was disobeyed, in the continuation of the practice, no religion was violated ? Among the ceremonies of interment in use among the heathen, the most essential and indispensable were banquets among the relations of the deceased. These, indeed, were not forbidden by the Mosaic Law, except to the Priests ; and to them only by virtue of the general prohibition of their interference in the obsequies of the dead ; with permission, however, in

^a v. 4.

the case of father, mother, son, daughter, brother, or virgin sister^a. These banquets were of two kinds. Banquets around the body of the deceased, before it was carried out; and a feast of the family and relations, after the obsequies were finished, and the body, or the ashes of it, entombed. Both are to be traced among the Gentiles up to the heroic ages. Of the first sort was the sumptuous feast, which Achilles made for his myrmidons around the body of Patroclus, while it lay unburied^b. Of the second, the banquet in Priam's palace, after the interment of Hector^c. The latter was the conclusion of the mourning. The relations of the deceased assumed the garb of festivity; for they were crowned with garlands, and celebrated the praises of the deceased^d. To this feast "the cup of consolation," mentioned Jer. xvi. 7. is probably to be referred, answering to the "circumpotatio;" which was interdicted among the Romans by the Decemviral Law, on account of the excess to which it was carried. The former feast, before the interment, was the Parentalia of the Romans, and the *περιδιπνία* of the Greeks. It is said, that the viands for this feast were contributed by the relations and friends of the deceased; and thence it is supposed to have acquired its Greek name. In the manner of the celebration among the Greeks, this banquet, in itself innocent, seems to have been connected with something of an idolatrous worship of the manes of the deceased. For in the parentalia of Patroclus, the company seem to have formed a ring around the dead body, placed in the center, which, in that situation, was plentifully wetted with the blood streaming from the slaughtered animals^e; which gives the banquet the appearance of a feast upon the victims.

^a Levit. xxi. 1—3.

^b ————— ὁ νῖκος ὁ τοῖσι τέφροι μνοτεικά δαῖνον.
Πολλὸς μὲν βίος ἀργοὶ ὁ ἔχθεον ἀμφὶ σιδῆρῳ
Σφαγίμενοι, πολλοὶ δὲ νῖσσις καὶ μηκάδες αἴγες.
Πολλὸι δὲ ἀργιόδοντες νῖσσι, θαλέθοις ἀλοιφῇ
Εὐέμνοι ταύνοι διὰ φλοιὸς Ἡφαίστοι.

Il. Ψ. 29, &c.

^c Χεύαντες δὲ τὸ σῆμα, πάλιν κιονὸν ἀντὶς ἐπιδια
Εὐ ουναγειάμενοι, δαῖνον ἐρικυλίν δαῖτα,
Δάμασιν ἐν Πριάμοιο διστηφίος βεστιλῆνος.

Il. Ω. 801.

^d Sequebantur epulæ, quas imibunt parentes coronati; apud quas de mortui laude, cum quidem veri erat, prædicatum. Cic. De Leg. Lib. II. c. 25.

^e Πάντη δὲ ἀμφὶ νέκυν κομιλησθεὶς ἔρρεεν αἷμα. Il. Ψ. 34.

sacrificed

sacrificed to the shade of the hero. The feast, however, not abused by this superstition in the manner of the celebration of it, was so much esteemed among the Jews an indispensable duty to the memory of the dead, that it was a part of Tobit's excellent exhortation to his son, to “pour out his bread upon the burial of the just^a;” that is, to be liberal in contribution of viands to the *ωρέθεινα*. These contributary viands were probably “the bread of men” of the Prophet Ezekiel^b. Among the Athenians it is said to have been the duty of a particular magistrate, to supply the provisions for this feast for the poorer citizens.

In the simplicity of the primitive ages, this feast was probably celebrated only a single day. It appears not, at least, that the parentalia of Patroclus were repeated. But in later times the feasts were continued every day, as long as the body lay above ground. Whence they acquired, among the Romans, the name of “Novendiales Epulæ.” For on the ninth day, the body, according to their practice, was carried out. The Jews proceeded to such profusion in these banquets, that Josephus says, many persons of condition reduced themselves to beggary by this expence^c: The viands served up at these funeral feasts, whether the parentalia, or the concluding feast after the funeral, were all unclean, by the use to which they were applied, and defiled all who ate of them; and all come properly under the denomination of the “meat of mourners.”

But there were other offerings consecrated to the dead, in rites of the grossest superstition; which may be included under the same denomination. Such were the libations of wine and oil poured upon the funeral pile, and the meats burned with the dead body.

Congesta cremantur
Thurea dona, dapes, fuso crateres olivo. *Æn. VI. 224.*

Such also were the provisions laid from time to time upon the tomb, or placed near the grave, for a repast for the shade of the deceased, which was supposed to feed upon them. These were properly the *κτερίσματα* of the Greeks, and the Silicernium of the Romans. They were sometimes offered for the purpose of

^a Tobit. iv. 17.

^b xxiv. 17.

^c *De Bello Judaico*, lib. II. c. 1.

magical

magical evocation, as in the *Odyssey*. Sometimes, to appease the ghost of a murdered man; as the offerings of Clytemnestra, at the tomb of Agamemnon, in the *Choephorœ* of *Æschylus*, and the *Electra* of *Sophocles*. But more frequently they were merely offerings of the relations in honour of the dead. It may seem almost incredible, that the chosen people of God should ever give into a practice of such horrible idolatry. But what may we not believe of those, who could “set their abominations in the house called by the name of “Jehovah,” and make their children “pass through the fire to Moloch?” And there is a text which brings them under strong suspicion, and seems plainly to insinuate, that they brought this practice with them out of Egypt, and continued it afterwards. In the 26th chapter of *Deuteronomy* there is a law, which requires of every one, who should present himself before God to offer his first fruits, to make a solemn profession, that he had *bonâ fide* applied the whole of his tithes to the religious and charitable uses prescribed by the laws of tithing; without subtraction of the smallest particle, upon any pretence, for any other purpose. “I have not eaten thereof in **MY MOURNING** [that is, I have consumed no part of them in feasts at the funerals of my relations,] neither have I taken away ought thereof for any unclean use, nor given ought thereof for the dead.” Or, more literally, “— nor given of it to a dead man.” Now what should this giving of the fruits of the ground, or of the flock, to a dead man be, but something analogous to the *silicernium* of the heathen? And why should this solemn profession be exacted, if the Israelites were not in fact addicted to this abominable practice? All these viands served up at the funeral feasts, and all the sepulchral cakes laid about the graves of the dead, as offerings to the departed spirit, were “meats of mourners,” and all in the highest degree, but especially the last, unclean.

It would be unpardonable not to apprise the reader, that in the interpretation I have given of the text in *Deuteronomy*, I differ widely from the learned Dr. Spencer; whose second chapter, of the second book of his work, upon the Hebrew ritual, entitled “*Lex, de professione triplici, post oblatas decimas & primitias, faciendâ*,” is well worth the reader’s perusal, if he delights in the refinements of deep erudition fancifully misapplied.

Upon the general subject of funeral feasts, and the rites of mourning, many interesting and judicious remarks are to be found in the notes of the learned Dr. Blayney, upon Jer. xvi. 5—8.

(G) ——— to themselves." So Abarbinel expounds the word **לְנֶפֶשׁם**, and after him Grotius. "Cibus eorum ipsis erit —" ipsorum tantum usibus servire poterit; quasi dicat, *όντως*.

(H) Their valuables of silver, &c." There is certainly much ambiguity in the grammatical construction of this passage, though the general sense is very clear. It describes the extreme devastation of the country, by the Assyrian conquest, under the image of weeds growing up in the dwellings, deserted by the owners, and stripped of their costly and elegant furniture of silver.

To ascertain the construction, I observe, in the first place, that **מהם** is a noun substantive, signifying generally whatever, for its value or beauty, is most desired. This is its frequent sense. The sense, in which some take it, and which the learned Pocock seems to prefer, of the places, in which such valuables were stored for safe keeping, or set out for use or ornament; though not inconsistent with the frequent import of the verbals formed with the heemantic **בְּ** prefixed, and with the peculiar force of that formative, is, I believe, in this word unexampled.

2. In the word **לְנֶסֶפֶם**, the prefix **לְ** denotes that **נֶסֶפֶם** is the material, in which these valuables were wrought². And when two words are connected, as these two are here; a pronoun, suffixed to the latter of the two, very often belongs properly to the former; which I take to be the case here. So that **נֶחָמֶד לְנֶסֶפֶם** may properly be rendered, "Their valuables of, or in, silver."

3. The two words **מהם לְנֶסֶפֶם** stand as a nominative absolute, expressing the principal subject of the sentence following; a figure of speech frequent in all the prophets, and in which Hosea particularly delights.

4. The verb **יַרְשֶׁבָ** is the third person singular future of the verb **רָשַׁב** in the Hiphil conjugation, with the pronoun plural of the third person suffixed. I say in the Hiphil conjugation; to which interpreters have not attended. For I cannot find, that the verbs quiescent Phe Jod ever form the third person singu-

² See Noldius, **ל**. §. 15.

lar of the future in Kal, or Pihel, with the double י. Buxtorf, indeed, cites two instances^a; the latter with some hesitation. But in the first, the Samaritan text, and the Complutensian Bible, give יוץ in the regular form. And in the second, the verb יָדַע seems to be in Hiphil, as Buxtorf himself allows it may be taken. For the true rendering of the verse I take to be, “ For Je-hovah is high, yet hath he respect unto the lowly ; but the lofty one from afar *maketh to feel.*” Compare Judges viii. 16, where many MSS. give יָדַע. And יָדַע is a Hiphil form of the future, though less regular than the double י. Now the verb יְרַשׁ, in the Hiphil conjugation, signifies “ to dispossess,” to drive out the former owner or occupier, and take possession in his room.

5. The nominatives of this Hiphil verb are the nouns קִימוֹשׁ and חֹתֶה. And בְּאֶהָלִים is to be taken as connected with both these nouns. Thus the exact rendering will be, “ Their valuables in silver—the nettle, the thistle in their dwellings shall dispossess them.”

6. The pronoun ס, suffixed to the verb יְרַשׁ, may rehearse either the people, the Israelites ; or their valuables, מְחֹמָר being taken as a collective. In the first way the sense will be, that the nettle and the thistle, growing up in the deserted mansions of the Israelites, shall dispossess them of their valuables ; in the second, that these weeds so growing up shall dispossess the valuables, i. e. occupy the place, which those costly things once filled. The latter, I think, the more easy and natural exposition.

If the learned reader is not satisfied with this exposition of the grammar of the text, he may find in Pocock all the constructions (except this) which the words can be brought to bear. And in the variety he may make his own choice.

(I) —— the Prophet.” The title of “ Prophet” seems to have been given to all of the prophetic order ; that is, to all who had been educated in the schools of the Prophets, and professed a life of retirement and religion : because these were usually the persons, to whom the gift of prophecy was imparted ; though it was by no means given to all, or even to the greater part of them. Some, perhaps, among them pretended to it, who had never received

^a Gen. ii. 7. and Ps. cxxxviii. 6.

it at all. And others, to whom it was in some degree given, temporised in the use of it, by profane accommodations to the humour of the people, the religious opinions, or the political measures of the court. Of the latter in particular we have a remarkable instance in those Prophets of Israel, who encouraged Ahab to the expedition against the Syrian, for the recovery of Ramoth Gilead, which proved so fatal to himself. That the gross imposture of pretences to inspiration, by persons that had it not at all, was actually practised, seems to be implied in Micah ii. 11. and Jer. xxiii. 31, 32. That those, who had the extraordinary gift, pretended, upon some occasions, to visions which they had never seen, and to commands which they had never received, is certain, from the very memorable story of the imposition practised by the old Prophet, who dwelt in Bethel at the time of the schism of the ten tribes, upon the man of God of Judah, who had prophesied against Jeroboam's altar^a. The old Prophet, whatever his crime might be in this deceit, and it certainly was great, appears to have been, in his general character, a true servant of God. But the more frequent crime was certainly that of temporising, in the manner of delivering messages of warning, which had been really received. The persons guilty of this conduct were deeply implicated in the guilt of the nation, and were promoters of the idolatry, to which the Kings and the people were so much addicted^b; and they are reproved and threatened in every page of the prophetical writings. These are the persons, who, in this text of Hosea, under the title of Prophets, are taxed with stupidity and madness.

The communication of the gift of prophecy, to persons so false to the duties of their office, seems somewhat analogous to the communication of the miraculous gifts, in the primitive church, to many who made, if not a wicked, certainly an improper and injudicious use of them. And analogous to the threatened punishment of false teachers, in the latter ages of Christianity, was the punishment of these prevaricating Prophets. "God sent them strong delusion that they should believe a lie^c." "If the Prophet be deceived when he hath spoken a thing, I the Lord have deceived that Prophet; and I will stretch out my hand upon him, and will destroy him from the midst of my people Israel^d." How it was, that God deceived the Prophet, is an awefull question, to be cautiously touched. It is evident, from the text of Ezekiel, that the Prophet himself was highly criminal in the deception

^a 1 Kings xiii.

^b Jer. xxiii. 15.

^c 2 Thess. ii. 11.

^d Ezek. xiv. 9.

that he suffered. It may be, that, for his unworthiness, the spirit of wisdom and understanding was withheld from him, which might have enabled him to discern the true meaning of the allegorical visions presented to his imagination. Or it may be, that, for the guilt of the nation, the prophetic spirit was imparted to those, who wilfully misinterpreted their visions. Thus the vision was true, and the whole falsity was in the error, or the dishonesty, of the Prophet. It is hardly to be conceived, that falsified scenes of futurity could be obtruded by the Holy Spirit on the Prophet's mind. I would observe, that in the case of Ahab, the lying spirit in the mouth of the Prophets, was not a spirit that lied to them, but a spirit that incited them to lie to the King.

(K) In proportion to." This is the force of **בָּ**. — according to."

(L) ——— his God." I read **אֱלֹהֵי**, with the Soncinum Bible of 1486, the notes of the Bible Minchath Shai, four MSS. of Dr. Kennicott's, two more originally, three of De Rossi's, and one more originally.

(M) ——— my God." I read **אֱלֹהִי**, with two MSS. of Dr. Kennicott's, and one originally of De Rossi's. The words **אֱלֹהֵי** and **אֱלֹהִים**, in this verse, seem to have changed places, to the great detriment of the emphasis.

(N) Luther's notion of this passage was not very different from mine. Existimo Antithesi uti Prophetam. — Sententia enim est, quod priora tempora habuerint veros prophetas; qui magno animo reprehenderunt idolatriam, & docuerunt verum Dei cultum. Sed qui nunc sunt, inquit, occasio sunt errorum & impietatis. Ponunt enim laqueos populo, &c. Diodati too agrees in this interpretation.

(O) ——— I found." The verb **מִצְאָה** here signifies not to find something in a place unexpected, but it is equivalent to the verb, "to find," or "trouver," in such expressions as these. "I find it very good." — "Je le trouve tres bon." — And the sense is, as grapes in the parched barren desert are found delightfull by the thirsty traveller, so was Israel antiently delighted in by God. See Pocock on the place. Calvin's remark is very judicious: "Porro non intelligit Propheta dignum fuisse populum, quem tantopere amaret: sed

"Hebræi

“ Hebræi dicunt “ Invenire,” quemadmodum etiam Gallicè dicimus, “ Je trouve cela a mon gout.” Reputavi igitur Israel tanquam uvas in de-“ ferto.”

(P) See chap. VIII. note (I).

(Q) ————— to that obscenity.” **לְבָשָׂת**. Luther takes the word **בָּשָׂת** for the name of the idol. For rendering the passage, “ Et sanctificaverunt se “ turpi Idolo,” he adds this note: “ Boshet autem sine dubio appellat idolum “ Peor, turpem & foedam statuam.” He certainly is not far from the truth, though the word **בָּשָׂת** is not altogether a proper name.

The word **פָּעַר**, as a verb, signifies to “ open.” It occurs in this sense in four places only, in all of which “ a mouth” is the object: in three, the human mouth: in the fourth^a, the mouth of Hades personified. It is never used as a noun, but in the name of the idol, Baal-Peor; and once, as the name of a hill^b. In the name of the idol it seems to be the infinitive used, as a noun; or as the Latin gerund in -*di*, after the preceding noun Baal. So that the name of the idol renders in English, “ The Lord of opening.” I take Baal-Peor, therefore, to have been worshipped as the power presiding over procreation; opening the womb, both for conception and for parturition; to have been in short the **Προθύραια** of the Orphic system^c.

This power was worshipped by the Greeks, under the name of Artemis. Her office extended far beyond the affairs of mere midwifery. She had not only propagation universally, not merely that of the human species, in her care. But as generation and corruption reciprocate in material things, she superintended both. And, being supposed to have in her power the issues of life and death, she was the general arbitress of the fortunes of men. She had a variety of titles, according to her various offices; and her family connections, her pedigree, and her consanguinity, are differently stated, according as she is contemplated in the exercise of one, or another, of her various powers. And from these different names and different stories, the poets, and their commentators, have made as many different goddesses. But “ *Ἄρτεμις*, *Εἰσιθνία*, *Προθύραια*,

^a Is. v. 14.

^b Num. xxxiii. 28.

^c Compare Hutchinson, “ On the Names of the Trinity of the Gentiles.” Tit. **בַּיִל פְּנַוֵּר**.

Δημήτηρ, Τίχη, Ἐκείνη, Jana, Diana, Partuna, Luna, Juno Lucina, were all the same power, considered in various acts, and worshipped with various rites, and under different symbols. But the paramount character of this divinity was that of the patroness of procreation; and, in this character, she was the Baal-Peor of the Moabites.

The learned reader will make it no objection, that all the titles, I have enumerated, of the Greek and Latin idol, are feminine; whereas Baal is a masculine. It was a first principle among the Mystagogues, that every God was of either sex. And this very personage, in the character of Selene, is saluted, in the Orphic invocations, as male and female, — θῆλυς τε καὶ ἄρσην^a, and was both Lunus and Luna among the Latins; and the word בְּשָׁת will lead to feminine appellations of Baal-Peor.

We are told, by Herodotus, that the Artemis of the Greeks was worshipped by the Egyptians, under the feminine appellation of Bubaftis, in the city of the same name^b. And in a Greek epigram, cited by H. Stephens, in his Thesaurus, Bubaftis is said to be a title of Isis, as the guardian goddess of women in labour. It is very remarkable, that Busbatos was a title of Diana, as Hesychius affirms, among the Thracians. The Egyptian rites of Bubaftis, as they are described by Herodotus^c, were in the highest degree obscene. But this is not all. The city Bubaftis (commonly written Bubaftos, but Herodotus writes it with an i) certainly took its name from the goddess. Now the name of the city, in the Prophet Ezekiel^d, is פִּי בְּשָׁת; which seems only a dialectic variation, as is observed by the learned Parkhurst^e, for פִּי בְּשָׁת. And the literal rendering of בְּשָׁת is “foramen turpitudinis.” Hence it is easy to guess, under what emblematical figure the goddess was worshipped, in the city that bore her name; and the conjecture is much confirmed by the attitudes, by which the Egyptian ladies are said to have expressed their devotions^f, in the annual festival of this object of their worship.

Hence I have no doubt, that in the word בְּשָׁת, as it is used here, and in some other texts of Scripture, there is a paronomasia; a favourite figure with the Prophets, which cannot be adequately expressed in a translation. To preserve what they could of it, our English translators have judiciously added

^a Orph. H. 8.

^b Euterpe, 156. and 59. and 138.

^c Euterpe, 60.

^d xxx. 17.

^e Lexicon, under the word בְּשָׁת.

^f Herodot. Euterpe, 60.

the

the demonstrative “that” to the word “shame,” by which they render the noun substantive; and I have followed their example, prefixing “that” to my word “obscenity.” By giving the appellative “shame,” or “obscenity,” without “that,” the appropriation of the word to the idol would be lost: and the sense of the name would be lost, if the Hebrew word “Boshet” were retained in the translation as a proper name.

The learned Vitringa has a notion of his own about this “consecrating of themselves to that obscenity.” He thinks some rite must be signified, by which some of the Israelites devoted themselves to the worship of that idol, “ut placerent amasis.” And so far he is probably in the right. But he conceives, that the particular rite was the circular tonsure of the hair, by which the Moabites and Arabs, according to Herodotus, marked themselves as worshippers of Dionysus. This opinion Vitringa sustains, with much learning and ability; but, as often happens to him, with too much refinement. It cannot be true, unless Baal-Peor was Dionysus. And of this he offers not a shadow of a proof^a.

The opinion, that Baal-Peor was Priapus, seems to have taken its rise from a random guess of St. Jerome’s, who understood that Baal Peor was something obscene; and looked no farther, than to something obscene in the Greek idolatry, to answer to the idol of the Moabites.

(R) Ephraim!” A nominative absolute.

(S) ————— when I turn away,” for בָשָׂרִי. I read, with the Bible of Hale (1720), three MSS of Kennicott’s, one originally of De Rossi’s, Aquila, Vulgate, Houbigant, and Archbishop Newcome, בָשָׂרִי.

(T) ————— to all appearance.” This I take to be the force of בְּאַשְׁר־דָּאֵיתִי. And so the LXX, ὅν τρόπον εἶδον; and to the same effect the Bishop’s Bible, “—— as methinks.”

Diodati’s rendering deserves attention. “—— mentre io l’ho regardato——.” “So long as I looked upon him.”—If this might be adopted, it would produce

^a See Vitringa, in If. xv. Not. Moab. §. 3.

an elegant antithesis between the happy effects of God's providential care, and the deplorable consequences of his turning away, mentioned in the preceding sentence. But I think, the Hebrew words will hardly bear this sense.

(V) ——— planted on a rock.” *εἰς πέτραν περιβλεψμένοι.* Th. And to the same sense, as it should seem, Aquila and Symmachus *ώς ακρότομον περιβλεψμένην* *ἐν κολοκίᾳ.*

(W) I remove the Soph-pasuk from צמחים, where I place only Rebbiah, to רעתם: that רעתם may be an accusative after תְּנִ, in apposition with רחם and שדים.

(X) ——— perverse practices.” See chap. V. note (B).

(Y) ——— blighted.” The allusion is evidently to a tree, killed by what is called a blight. The verb נכה is often used in this particular sense of blighting^a. Dr. Pocock thinks that the word, though used in a much larger signification, is “in proper language spoken of trees and plants, when by any chance “marred.” See his note upon this place. I have sometimes been inclined to adopt the construction and rendering of the Syriac. “Ephraim is smitten at “the root; he is dried up, so that he shall bear no fruit.” The version of the LXX, when it is rightly pointed, is to the same effect. Ἐπόνετεν Εφραΐμ
·τας πέζας αύτῷ. ἐξηράνθη, παρπὸν οὐκ ἔτι μὴ ἐνίγκη.

^a Ps. cii. 5. Amos iv. 9. and Jonah iv. 7.

CHAP. X.

(A) ——— yielding.” בָּקָק yielding. The root בָּקָק, or בָּקָה, signifies properly, to empty a vessel of its contents. Hence “vastare.” But a vine “emptying itself,” must be a vine pouring forth its internal strength in abundance of fruit². All the antient versions, except the Chaldee, agree in rendering the participle as expressive of luxuriance. Symmachus, indeed, renders it by a word that denotes “running to wood,” ὑλομανθάνει, and Aquila, by ἐνδύρεις, “a watery vine,” which St. Jerome explains to be a vine bearing grapes, which gave but a thin and watery juice, such as would not make good wine. But the context shews, that fertility of fruit is meant, and this idea is conveyed in all the other versions. ἐντληματίζονται. LXX. “abounding in goodly branches.” But goodly branches are branches which bear fruit; and accordingly this version adds, καρπὸς εὐθηνῶν αὐτῆς. The Vulgate renders the participle of leaves, “Vitis frondosa Israel;” but then he adds, “fructus adæquatus est ei.” The Syriac حَدَبَتْ بَلْمَسْ بَلْمَسْ! “A branchy vine is Israel, which beareth fruit.” The fruit, however, is not to be understood of the fruit of good works, as I have explained in note².

(B) ——— his fruit was answerable to his vigour," literally, " — and his fruit was equalled to himself." So the Vulgate, " fructus adæquatus " est ei."

(C) ——— God himself." This I take to the force of אָנָה. And so it is understood by St. Jerome.

(D) Negotiate —,” literally, if **דברו** be taken as an imperative, “Talk words.” — I take **אלות** as another accusative, in apposition with **רבדים**, after

² See Parkhurst, under the word בָּקָר.

the verb **דִבְרוּ**; and **כִּרְתָּה**, as the infinitive used for the imperative, which is very common. “Talk words,” i. e. “negotiate.”—Among the Indian tribes of America, a public conference to settle differences is called “a talk.”

(E) “Hemlock” **רָאשָׁת** may be a general name for the vegetable poisons, hemlock, aconite, &c. from their common property of affecting the head. Compare Dr. Blaney, on Jer. viii. 14.

(F) ——— the inhabitants.” I take **שָׁכַן** here as a collective, with all the antient versions. As I think, the same word (though differently pointed by the Masoretes) is used in Ps. cxxxv. 21. For I would render that verse thus: “Blessed be Jehovah in Sion. O inhabitants of Jerusalem, praise ye Jah.” To be rendered with the versions, ——— that dwelleth in Jerusalem,” i. e. Jehovah that dwelleth, the word should be **הַשָּׁכֵן**.

(G) ——— shall be in consternation.” Of the four verbs, **גָּרָה**, **גָּרָר**, **גָּרָה**, **גָּרָר**, see chap. VII. note (M).

The word **גָּרָר**, here, can be nothing but the third person plural future in Kal of the verb **גָּרָה**, regularly formed, according to the rule of conjugation of the verbs quiescent Ain ּ, and the verb must be taken in its secondary sense of being in consternation.

(H) ——— for the great calf.” **לְעִגְלָה**. It is not to be concluded from the feminine form of the noun, that the idol was a heifer. “Imagines parent ‘sexu,’ says Vatablus. I conceive that when the living animal is in question, the masculine, **עִגְלָה**, renders a bull-calf, the feminine, **עִגְלָה**, a cow-calf. But that speaking of the image of a calf, the feminine, **עִגְלָה**, may be used of the figure either of the bull, or the cow. The plural number is used, because the calf of Beth-el (here called Bethaven, because it was become the temple of an idol), was in its size, and the riches of the temple, the principal image. “—— quod Vitulus, qui in Bethel colebatur, esset præcipuus,” says Vatablus. I render the word, therefore, “the great calf.” This noun in the feminine and plural form, is rehearsed in this text by a masculine and singular pronoun.

(I)

(I) ——— exulted.” **גָּלַל**. The future, even without the conversive **וְ**, is often used for the præterite, according to Kimchi, as he is quoted by Buxtorf. “Frequentissima est temporum enallage—Præteriti pro futuro, & futuri pro præterito, tum per se & simpliciter in prophetis, tum propter præfixam “literam **וְ**.”

(K) For **אָתָּה**, I read with the Soncinensian Bible of 1488, the Brescian of 1494, the Pelaro Prophets of 1516, the Venice Bible of 1518; the Basil of 1536, which is the second of Munster's, and twenty MSS of Kennicott's, **אָתָּה**.

(L) See chap. V. note (I).

(M) ——— in found sleep.” I take the word **בָּשָׂנָה** for the substantive **שָׂנָה** (heavy sleep), with the prefix. I know not how it can be regularly formed from the root **שָׂן**, to signify shame. The Vulgate, indeed, and the Chaldee, seem to favour this derivation and this sense. For the Vulgate renders the word by “confusio,” and takes it as the nominative of the verb. The Chaldee word **בָּהָתָּא** is properly shame. But perhaps it may signify confusion, or inactivity of the faculties, from any other cause. The Syriac **מְשֹׁׁמְּרָה** **לְלֹאָהָר** might, I think, be rendered, “Confusion shall “darken Ephraim;” which, if the noun **לְלֹאָהָר** may signify “confusion,” or torpidity of the mind generally, is exactly my sense, though it deviates from the construction. And this sense of the noun is, in some measure, confirmed by chap. xi. 1. according to the division which the Syriac translator follows; where the verb **לָאָהָר** is joined with the verb **יָלַד**, the clause being to this effect, “In the morning, the King of Israel wondered, and was astounded.” The text of the LXX is in such a state, that no conclusion can be drawn from it of their reading or their sense. St. Jerome's LXX seems to have **εἰς δόματα Εφραίμ διέξεται αἰσχύνην**. But, taking the Greek text as it now stands, I would propose to correct it thus: **εἰς δόματα διέξεται Εφραίμ**. Taking **εἰς δόματα** in the sense of “languor,” from the verb **εἰσδίδωμι**.

(N) ——— like a bubble.” בְּקַצְפָּה. “ Bullam interpretor. — Dicitur “ autem bulla קַצְפָּה a קַצְפָּה, quod fervore & bullire significat, quia fervoris & “ ebullitionis effectum est.” Livelye.

Mr. Woide first proposed the division of the clauses which I follow, putting Rebbia or Athnach at שְׁמַרְוֹן, and understanding the verb substantive after מלכה

(O) ——— It overtook them not — iniquity.” I have preserved the exact collocation of the words in the original, that the ambiguity arising from it (if any) might remain in the translation. The clear sense, and the only sense, unless the particle נִלְמָד be taken interrogatively, is that which I have given and explained in note (n). Taking the נִלְמָד interrogatively, the words must be thus rendered: “ Overtake it not them in Gibeah, the children of iniquity?” That is, “ Did not the war against the children of iniquity overtake them (i. e. “ those children of iniquity) in Gibeah?” The pertinence of the interrogation to the subject might be, “ Did I not thus execute judgement on those “ sinners? Much more will I execute judgement on you, who are worse sin- “ ners.” But this rendering is not so easy and natural, as the former. The pronoun נִלְמָד suffixed to the verb, in this way of taking the sense, must refer to the children of iniquity, which are placed after it in the sentence; a construction by no means unexampled, but not to be admitted without necessity.

(P) ——— when they are tethered down to their two furrows.” בְּאַסְרָם לְשֵׁתִי עִנְתָּמִים. For the last word, the Keri gives עִנְוֹתָם. The editions and MSS differ. The varieties of the Venetian Bible of 1518, eleven MSS of Kennicott's, and one more originally, agree with the Keri. Thirteen MSS of Kennicott's, and three more originally, give עִנְתָּמִים. The Complutensian Bible, and one MS of Kennicott's, give עִנְוֹתָם. The text of the Venetian Bible of 1518, and the Bible of Hale of 1536 (Munster's 2d), the Drescian of 1494, the Soncinensian latter Prophets of 1486, and eight MSS of Kennicott's, give עִנְוֹתָם. I take עִנְתָּמִים, עִנְוֹתָם, and עִנְוֹתָם, to be in fact the same word, written defectively in some MSS, and in its perfect form in others. The authorities, therefore, for the Keri seem to preponderate; especially if we add those of the LXX, Syr. and Vulg. If עִנְוֹתָם be the true reading, it might signify iniquities;

iniquities; and in this sense it is taken by the LXX. Syr. and Vulg. and many modern critics, who all render to this effect: — when they shall be chastised for their two iniquities." And modern expositors understand by the two iniquities the two calves of Dan and Bethel. This may seem at first an easy and obvious sense. But, upon a narrower inspection of the Hebrew words, it will be found, that they will not bear it.

In the first place, the word בָּאָסֵר cannot otherwise be resolved, than into אָסֵר, with the prefix בְּ, and the suffixed pronoun מְ. The word אָסֵר, under the prefix בְּ, cannot be derived from the root יִסְרָר, "to chastise." And of the two alterations of the text, offered by Archbishop Newcome to his readers choice, neither is justified by any sufficient authority; unless that of the three versions of LXX. Syr. and Vulg. without a single MS, and without any exigence of the place, may be deemed such. Much authority is indeed due to the concurrence of antient versions, and especially of these three. But, in the present instance, it is by no means certain, that we have the consent of the three, or the authority indeed of any one of them, for an alteration of the text in this word. The more probable conclusion from their versions seems to be, that there is a great affinity of sense (as many men of learning have observed) between the two roots, אָסֵר and יִסְרָר; which is the case, in various other instances, between roots quiescent Phe ' and others quiescent Phe נ; and that they took אָסֵר in this place in the sense of יִסְרָר.

2. But admitting that the word אָסֵר might be so taken; or, if it cannot be so taken, admitting, in deference to the versions, one or other of Archbishop Newcome's altered readings, still there will be great difficulty in the construction. I know of no instance in which the prefix לְ is used, as what some grammarians call *Causalis rei præteritæ*, or as the preposition of the reason, or motive of action, arising in the consideration of something past. Which must be the use of it here, if לְשָׁתִי עֲוֹנוֹתָם is to be rendered "for their two iniquities." It is true, that, among the enallages of the prepositions, grammarians mention לְ used for the detached לְיָ. But then it is for לְיָ in the sense of "against," or "upon," or "close to," not as signifying "upon account of." The prefix לְ indeed sometimes signifies "according to the rule or measure of," or, "in proportion to." Thus Jeremiah xxx. 11. וַיִּסְרַתִּיךְ לְמִשְׁפָט, where לְמִשְׁפָט is equivalent to בְּמִשְׁפָט. chap. x. 24. And the learned Dr. Blaney judiciously remarks, that the word מִשְׁפָט in these texts signifies that "calm and dispa-

" sionate

“ sionate judgement, which stands opposed to the hasty fallies of anger and furious revenge.” And the sense of the former is, “ But I will correct thee according to measure of such judgement.” Again, Ezekiel xxii. 6. **אֲשֶׁר לֹרֶשׁ**. “ — each in proportion to his power.” — And in this place of Hosea the prefix **ל** might render “ in proportion to,” if iniquities had been mentioned without limitation to the number two. “ When they are chastised in proportion to their iniquities.” But to take the prefix in this sense, with respect to “ two iniquities,” would produce a litosis, little consistent with the vehemence of the discourse. For to punish in proportion to two iniquities, would be to “ punish twice,” and only twice.

Upon these considerations, I am perswaded, that in the word **בְּאָסְרָם**, is the infinitive mood of the root **אָסָר** in its own proper sense of “ binding,” “ tying to,” “ fastening to, or upon,” or, in some respect, “ confining, restraining.” The suffixed pronoun **וּ** expresses the persons which are the objects of such, binding, tying, fastening, confinement, or restriction; and the noun following, under the prefix **ל**, must denote that, to or upon which, those persons are bound, tyed, fastened, confined, or restrained. Indeed the verb **אָסָר**, to bind, properly governs the thing to which, by the prefix **ל**^a. There are two of these things; and it remains to enquire, what they may be.

It is supposed that the word **תְּוִנָּי**, the plural of **וִנְנָה**, may render “ furrows in a ploughed field.” No other passage is to be found in the whole Bible, in which the word is used in this sense. And the process of criticism, by which this sense is deduced from the etymology of the noun, as derived from the root **וָנָה**, may seem rather far-fetched. The noun **מִעֵנָה**, from the root **וָנָה**, certainly signifies “ a furrow^b.” Hence it is concluded, that the verb **וָנָה** may signify “ to make a furrow.” No example of this sense of the verb occurs; but it is certainly very consistent with its general sense, furrows being drawn to correspond in parallel lines. And if this sense of the verb be admitted, the noun **וִנְנָה**; or **וִנְנָה**, if that be the true orthography, may signify “ a furrow.” The only authority for this meaning of the word, among the antients, is Jonathan. But it is received with approbation by the most learned of the Rabbin, and by the majority, and the most able, of the Christian expositors. By Munster in particular, by Vatablus, Calvin, Tarnovius, and the learned Drusius. The latter, in his

^a See Gen. xlvi. 11.

^b See 1 Sam. xiv. 14. and Ps. cxxix. 3.

annotations upon the Vulgate, goes so far as to say, that it is the only sense the word will bear. For proposing this correction of the rendering of the Vulgate, “*Cum ligavero eos in duobus sulcis ipsorum*,” he adds, “*& ita nec ceslario videtur reddendum ex Codice Hebraeo.*” The necessity, indeed, which this great critic supposes, is founded entirely on the Masoretic rules of punctuation; and the sense, which he esteemed so necessary, is rejected, as ill-suited to the context, by two other critics of great learning and great penetration, Luther, and Livelye.

Those, who adopt this sense of the word, all seem to agree, that the image, which the clause presents, is that of a pair of heifers yoked to the plough; which I take to be erroneous. For the furrows are two. —— bound to or upon their *two furrows*.” But a plough, though dragged by a pair of heifers, makes but one furrow at a time; and this is the one furrow of both heifers. Two of the Jewish expositors, Abn Walid, and R. Tanchum, avoid this discordance between the words and the supposed image, by imposing on the word **רְבָעָה**, the sense not of furrows, but of “plowing heifers.” But how this image of “plowing heifers,” or “heifers yoked to the plough to make furrows,” represents the ten tribes, is but ill-agreed among those, who receive the one or the other of these senses of the word; and no one among them, either Jew or Christian, has given any tolerable elucidation of the matter.

If “furrows” be the true sense of the word **רְבָעָה**, I am inclined to think the being bound, or confined, to their two furrows may be a proverbial expression, not much unlike the more homely proverb of our own language, of “an ass between two bundles of hay;” describing the situation of a person fluctuating in his choice between two things, of which he must choose one. In like manner, the situation of extreme difficulty to which the Israelites were reduced under their latter Kings, without any human means of relief, but in the choice of one of the two alliances, between which they were ever fluctuating, that of Assyria, and that of Egypt, may be represented under the image of an animal tethered by a short rope, in such a manner that its utmost liberty of feeding is but the breadth of a single ridge between two furrows, one on the one side, one on the other. The only objection, of which I am aware, to this interpretation of the image is, that pasture-grounds are not usually laid down in ridge and furrow, and animals are not usually tethered to feed in corn-land.

But

But if the word **רָשָׁוֹת** be taken to signify “iniquities,” or “faults,” the passage may be brought to the same general meaning, dismissing the image of a tethered animal, and rendering, “— when they are tied to their two faults,” or, with the Syr. “— their two follies.” The two alliances, already mentioned, might be called the two faults of the people, as both were repeatedly reprobated by the Prophets, and yet the people were always courting the one or the other of them. Or they might be called their two “follies.” For they never formed the one or the other, but they experienced the folly of the measure. Their ally, whichever of the two they chose, always proved a treacherous friend; and yet the name of an alliance with one always drew down the resentment and vengeance of the rival power. They were tied to these two faults, or two follies, when, by God’s just desertion of them, they were cut off from all prospect of any better aid, than one or the other of these alliances might offer to their hopes, and felt themselves obliged to make a choice.

And after all, if it be asked for what reason the word **שְׁנוֹתָם** may not be taken, as it is taken by all the antients except Jonathan, in particular by that most excellent interpreter, the author of the Syriac version, in the sense of “iniquities,” “faults,” or “follies;” I say, that the objection stands upon no other grounds, than that of the principles of the Masoretic punctuation. From this arises all the necessity, which the learned Drusius holds out, of the other sense. For the single authority of Jonathan, though respectable, will hardly be allowed to constitute a necessity, especially when set against that of the LXX, Syr. and Vulg. The textual word, or Cetib, is **שְׁנָוֹתָם**. By the decree of the Masoretes the Keri must always take the vowel points applied to the Cetib. The Keri, therefore, pointed in conformity to this rule, must be **שְׁנוֹתָם**, in which both the **וֹ**’s are quiescent in Cholem. And this word cannot be derived from the root **רָשָׁוֹת**, to signify “their iniquities,” because we have nothing but Cholem to represent the omitted **ה** of the root; and, by another decree of the Maforetes, one vowel point cannot supply the absence of two letters; or, in other words, the **וֹ** in **רָשָׁוֹת** cannot be quiescent. But put the point Chateph-patach under the initial **וֹ**, and give the Cholem to **וֹ** consonant, that the word may be **שְׁנוֹתָם**, and then the sense of iniquities will be imposed upon the word by the very same necessity, upon the principles of the

Masoretic

Masoretic system, by which, according to the other pointing, it is excluded: that is by no necessity at all, but the arbitrary rules of uninspired expositors of the sacred text. It is true, that the more regular orthography of this feminine noun would be שִׁנְזָהָב. But in the masculine form the word is usually written without the second י. “In textu plerumque scribitur,” says the learned lexicographer Robertson, “cum simplice Vau ante Cholem absque Vau sustentetur tunc.” And for what reason a like omission of the quiescent Vau may not take place in the feminine form of the noun, since the only reason of the omission is the quiescence of the letter, let the believers in the Masoretes explain.

(Q) —— I delighted in treading out grain.” To this effect Castalio.

(R) —— I will make Ephraim carry me.” To this effect LXX, Syr. Vulg. Luther, Castalio, Junius and Tremellius, and Grotius, who adds this remark, “solent interdum rustici insidere bobus.”

(S) “If we read as Shalman destroyed Beth-Arbel, reference is made to a fact, not elsewhere recorded,” says Archbishop Newcome. And so said Luther long before him: “Historia, cuius hoc in loco Propheta meminit, nusquam extat.” And so said Diodati: “— questa istoria non è discritta altrove —.” But it never occurred to Luther, or to Diodati, that this would justify violent alterations of the text, to obtrude upon the Prophet an allusion to a history, which is indeed extant, but to which no man, without the gift of inspiration, can know, that the Prophet meant to allude. The sense of the passage is as clear, as it could be if the history were known. The allusion is to a military exploit, well known we may be sure in Hosea’s time, in which the conqueror spared neither sex nor age. And the Israelites are threatened with an equal calamity. Upon the subject of such emendations, as they are called, as have been proposed in this place, I present the reader with the judgment of the great Pocock. Having mentioned a remark of Drusius, that the LXX appear to have found בָשָׁר in their copies instead of כָּשָׁר (but Drusius never set up this as a true reading), and Capellus’s crotchet of changing כָּשָׁר into בָשָׁר upon no authority at all, to make the text agree with some imaginations in history of his own; Pocock says, “By the same reason, every one,

“ for introducing any where such a meaning, as pleased him best, might alter the words, as he pleased, of which there would be no end ; and it would be a matter of very ill consequence : we must fit our meaning to the words, and not the words to our meaning.” And afterwards, having mentioned the alterations of the proper names proposed by Grotius, which Houbigant adopts, and Archbishop Newcome from Houbigant, he says, “ But it will be too bold for us to follow his conjecture, as before we said concerning that of Cappellus ; if we should give ourselves that liberty, we should have in this verse three different readings : one from the Greek, in reading **בְּשָׂר** for **כְּשָׂר** ; another from Capellus, reading for it **בְּשָׂר**, and another from Grotius in reading **בַּיד** for **בַּית**. And why may not some others, by the same authority, make others both here or any where else ; so that we shall not know where to fix ? It will be the only safe way to keep our reading as we have it, and to lay any fault or incongruity, which we meet with, on the expositions, not on the words read in the text.” Thus this sober critic.

It is worthy of remark, however, that the Vulg. St. Jerome, and the LXX suppose that the history alluded to is Gideon’s destruction of Zalmunna. I join the LXX, with the two others, because the reading of the Alexandrian MS, *Ιεροβαλ* for *Ιεροβαλμ*, is confirmed by St. Jerome’s version of the LXX. St. Jerome says, that Arbel and Jerubbaal are names of the same signification.

I must observe further, that St. Jerome, the Vulg. and the LXX, all expressing the word **בַּית** in their versions, clearly reprobate the change of it into **בַּיד**.

(T) As the morning ——.” For **בְּשָׂר**, I read with the latter Prophets of Soncinum of 1486, the varieties of the Venice Bible of 1518, the Bible of Hale of 1720, ten MSS. of Dr. Kennicott’s, three more originally, five of De Rossi’s, and three more originally, and with St. Jerome, and St. Cyril of Alexandria, and the Vulg. **כְּשָׂר**:

The simile is expounded by St. Jerome, in his Commentary ; and by St. Cyril of Alexandria, and by Theodoret, in the sense which I have given in (y) of the explanatory notes. This exposition the prefix **בְּ** would not admit. It is strange, that Archbishop Newcome should have thought the two readings equivalent.

(V) ——— brought to nothing." The force of the word **דָמָה**, when it is used, as here, to signify a total destruction, is very often what cannot be adequately expressed in any word, hardly in any two or three put together, of the English language. From its leading sense of assimilation, it may naturally signify the making of a thing all alike, inside and out, from top to bottom: hence the obliterating of all features and distinctions; the resolution of any organised substance into the promiscuous mass of unformed, undistinguished atoms, of which it is composed; the not leaving of a vestige of a form behind. The reducing of a thing to its *ὕλη ἀράτη*. We express much the same sort of destruction, but with less force, and much less propriety, by the verb "to 'annihilate."

I would observe by the way, that of the four words, **דָמָה**, **דָם**, **דָמָה**, and **דָם**, the middle pair are certainly distinct from the extreme pair. Of the two **דָם** and **דָמָה**, I take the noun **דָם**, "silence," to be the primary root, and the verb **דָמָה**, "to be silent," or to make silent, to be derived from that noun. Of the other pair, if they are not two distinct roots, I take **דָמָה**, "to be" "like," or "to assimilate," to be the root, and the noun **דָם**, "blood," to be derived from that root; the blood taking its Hebrew name, as Mr. Parkhurst, with great probability, conjectures, "from its property of being assimilated "or confirmed, in the course of its circulation, to all the various constituent parts of the body, which want supply or nourishment." But with the root **דָם** the root **דָמָה** seems to have no connection². Mr. Parkhurst brings all these words, and all their derivatives, under the single root **דָמָה**, which, I think, is injudicious.

To return to the text of Hosea, it is to be remarked, that St. Jerome, Vulg. LXX, and the Syr. make the 10th chapter end with the word **רָעַתְכֶם**, "wickedness," in the 15th verse, and carry on the subsequent clause to the beginning of the 11th chapter. And the Syriac very strangely connects it with the assertion of God's love of Israel, when he was a child. For his rendering is to this effect, "In the morning, the King of Israel was astonished "and astounded, because, while Israel was a child, I loved him." As if the love of Israel at the beginning was the cause of the King of Israel's astonishment. It must have been the false division of the chapter, that led that interpreter into this error, and equally misled Jerome, Vulg. and LXX; who all seem to assign God's love for the infant Israel, as the reason of the King of Israel's sudden destruction.

² See Appendix, No III.

CHAP. XI.

(A) ————— my son.” —— ταὶ τέκνα αὐτῷ. LXX. But this and the Chatdee only of the antient versions give the noun in the plural, and the LXX only give it with the pronoun of the third person. St. Matthew’s citation is in conformity with the Hebrew text, not with LXX.

(B) In the explanatory note (‘), I have cited Deut. xxxiii. 7, as a passage relating to the Messiah. It will not be foreign therefore to my purpose, to endeavour to deliver this text, containing indeed a remarkable prophecy of the Messiah’s connection with the tribe of Judah in particular, from the obscurity in which the Masoretic pointing has enveloped it. It runs thus in the public translation :

“ And this [is the blessing] of Judah : and he said, Hear, Lord, the voice “ of Judah, and bring him unto his people : let his hands be sufficient for “ him, and be thou an help [to him] from his enemies.”

This is indeed a very faithfull rendering of the words, as they are pointed by the Masoretes, and in the passage, so rendered, no mention of the Messiah appears. For the elucidation of this disfigured text, I shall begin with the latter clause ; which will be a key to the true meaning of the former.

The latter clause may be thus rendered, without the alteration even of a point : “ Great is his power for himself, and thou shalt be help from his enemies.” יְהִי — “ his power,” not his hands. The use of יְהִי in the plural, as well as in the singular, for power, is unquestionable. And the construction of the plural, in the sence of power, with a singular verb, is not unexampled^a. This clause is so evidently characteristic of the Messiah, who, with greatness of power of his own, in his human nature depended upon God’s support ; that some commentators have supposed, that the proper name of Ju-

^a. See Josh. viii. 20.

dah is here to be understood of Christ^a. “ — hæc unicè conveniunt,” says Houbigant, “ in eum Judam, de quo Jacob; ‘ Juda, adorabunt filii patris tui,’ ‘ quem Judam optat Moses advenire ad populum suum; i. e. in terras venire, ‘ et cum homine conversari.’ ”

But it is not true, that the Messiah is designed under the name of Judah, in the last words of Jacob. The Messiah and Judah are mentioned by the patriarch under different appellations, as distinct persons; and there is no reason to think they are confounded here.

Dr. Kennicott imagines an emphatic reference of the pronoun “ Him” (bring Him) to Christ.

“ Bring HIM unto his people —,” i. e. bring unto his people, in thy good time, Him, the King, the Shiloh of the tribe of Judah.

Passages, I believe may be found, in which the mention of the Messiah is first introduced, by a pronoun carrying an emphasis like that of the Greek and Latin pronouns *ἐνώπιος*, and *ἰστε*, when they demonstrate some very remarkable person not mentioned before. But then this emphatical reference of the pronoun must be made evident, by a construction of the sentence, which shall exclude the reference of it to any person or thing expressly named. In this case, the pronominal suffix of the verb naturally rehearses Judah mentioned in the preceding clause; “ hear the voice of Judah.”

But there will be no necessity for this unnatural reference of the pronominal suffix, or for any mystic exposition of the proper name of the tribe (by which the tribe itself, as the declared object of the blessing, must be intended here), when this clause, “ Bring, &c.” is rescued from the obscurity, with which the points have covered it. We shall find the Messiah mentioned, under an appellation that most properly belongs to him, the appellative **אֶל**; which the Masoretes by their mis-pointing have turned into the preposition **אֶל**. But point the word with Tzere instead of Sægol, and the entire verse must be thus rendered :

And this for Judah. — And he said,

Hear, O Jehovah, the voice of Judah

וְאֶל עַמּוֹ תִּבְאִין

^a See Poole's Synopfis, and Houbigant.

1 And bring thou unto him, תַּבְיאֵנוּ, the Mighty One of His people.

Great for himself shall be his power,
And thou shalt be an help from his enemies.

תַּבְיאֵנוּ “bring him,” i. e. “bring to him.” The verb “bring,” and some others, which in Latin require a dative of the person, and an accusative of the thing; in Hebrew, as in English, often admit two accusatives; one of the thing, and another of the person.

אֵל נָמוֹ “the mighty one of his people.” So Ezek. xxxi. 11. אֵל נָמוֹ “the mighty one of the heathen.” אֵל, applied to man, seems to be something more than נָבָר. See Ezek. xxxii. 21. The plural אֵלִים is frequently used for “leaders.” And here perhaps, and in Ezek. xxxi. 11. the singular אֵל might be rendered the leader, the captain, or the chief. But I prefer “mighty one;” because the Hebrew word seems to involve the idea of pre-eminence in valour, and power to help, or power in the act of helping, rather than in rank.

(C) ——— from my presence, they !” I divide מִפְנֵיכֶם into two words, thus, מִפְנֵי הַם. For which I have the authority of LXX, and Syr. and the approbation of Houbigant and Archbishop Newcome. But I agree not to the removal of the stop, made by those two learned writers, in order to thrust the separated word הַם into the subsequent clause. On the contrary, I would alter the stops in the Greek of LXX. — ἀπάχοιτο ἐκ τεροσώπων μη αὐτοῖς τοῖς, &c. A similar instance of a pleonasm of a pronoun nominative at the end of a sentence, has occurred, chap. v. 14. The Deinosis produced by it is vehement.

(D) We read frequently, in our English Bibles, of graven images, and of molten images. And the words are become so familiar, as names of idolatrous images, that although they are not well chosen to express the Hebrew names, it seems not advisable to change them for others, that might more exactly correspond with the original.

The graven image was not a thing wrought in metal by the tool of the workman we should now call an engraver; nor was the molten image, an image

image made of metal, or any other substance melted, and shaped in a mould. In fact, the graven image and the molten image are the same thing, under different names. The images of the antient idolaters were first cut out of wood, by the carpenter, as is very evident from the Prophet Isaiah. This figure of wood was overlaid with plates either of gold or silver, or, sometimes perhaps, of an inferior metal. And in this finished state it was called a graven image (i. e. a carved image), in reference to the inner solid figure of wood, and a molten (i. e. an overlaid, or covered) image, in reference to the outer metalline case or covering^a. And sometimes both epithets are applied to it at once. “I will cut off the graven and molten image^b.” Again, “What profiteth the graven and molten image^c? ” The English word “molten” conveys a notion of melting, or fusion. But this is not the case with the Hebrew word, for which it is given. The Hebrew נָסַךְ signifies, generally, to overspread, or cover all over, in whatever manner, according to the different subject, the overspreading or covering be effected; whether by pouring forth a substance in fusion, or by spreading a cloth over or before, or by hammering on metalline plates. It is on account of this metalline case, that we find a founder employed to make a graven image^d. And that we read in Isaiah^e of a workman that “melteth a graven image;” and in another place^f we find the question, “who hath molten a graven image?” In these two passages the words should be “overlayeth,” and “overlaid.”

(E) ——— a go-nurse,” תְּרִגְלִתִּי. It is impossible to make this word a verb of any form, unless we would coin a conjugation on purpose, as some of the Jewish grammarians have done, calling it the conjugation Tiphel; though no other verb is to be found in this conjugation of theirs, nor this supposed verb, in this conjugation, in any other place. But the word is a noun substantive; either the feminine תְּרִגְלִתִּה, with a paragogic י, or the feminine תְּרִגְלָה, with a final ה, turned into ת before the suffixed pronoun of the first person.

If the י be simply paragogic, the noun signifies that sort of nurse, who is employed in the office of teaching a young child to go, in the manner described, in the explanatory note (d).

^a See the learned Mr. Parkhurst, in his Hebrew Lexicon, under the word נָסַךְ.

^b Nah. i. 14. ^c Hab. ii. 18. ^d Judges xvii. 3. ^e xl. 19. ^f If. xlii. 10.

If the ' be the suffixed pronoun, the noun תַּרְגַּלְתִּי expresses the stepping or pacing of the nurse after the child^a. The former seems to me the easier, and the better exposition, though both come to the same sense. The Vulgate seems to have adopted the former; the LXX, the latter. "Et ego quasi nutritius "Ephraim." Vulg. Καὶ ἐγὼ συνεπόδισα τὸν Εφραῖον. i. e. "And I stepped along "with Ephraim." For I cannot think that συνεπόδισα is to be taken here, as St. Jerome takes it, in its common sense of tying the two feet together. Or, as St. Cyril of Alexandria^c understands it, of bringing the legs and thighs together, by the bending of the knees, in the sitting posture. I confess, I cannot produce another instance, in which the word συμποδίζειν signifies "to step "along with." But there are many peculiarities in the phraseology of the LXX. The simple verb ποδίζειν often renders "incedere," and the compounds ἀναποδίζειν and προποδίζειν, "referre pedem," and "proferre pedem."

It is to be observed, that some even of the Jewish grammarians take the word תַּרְגַּלְתִּי as a noun. But the great oracle Elias would not allow it, for this weighty reason; that, if it were a noun, it ought to have the accent on the last syllable, the annexed ' requiring that collocation of the accent. Place the accent therefore upon the last syllable, and there is an end of Elias's objection.

(F) ——— taking them." סַחַר. "Infinitivum anomalum," says Lively. Buxtorf and Archbishop Secker thought סַחַר might be the præterit of the verb לִקְחַה; but De Rossi would admit an aphæresis of the ה in Benoni, whose opinion I adopt.

This verb סַחַר is found in the præterite, without the first radical, in Ezek. xvii. 5. Buxtorf^b produces two instances (but both are doubtfull) of verbs quiescent Phe Jod, יְרַד and סַחַר, dropping the first radical in the præterite. If a verb drops the first radical in the præterite, there seems no reason why the like aphæresis should not take place in the Infinitive or Benoni. And the verb סַחַר seems to have had peculiar anomalies. In Jer. v. 3. and in 2 Kings xii. 8. it forms the infinitive like the verbs defective Phe Nun, dropping the first radical, but assuming a final ה. The anomalies seemed so extraordinary to Avenarius, that he had recourse to his usual expedient, of coining another root סַחַר.

^a See Parkhurst לְגַנְתִּי. II.

^b Thef. Gramm. lib. I. c. 13.

— over the shoulders," over his shoulders ; but I omit the pronoun, to avoid the discordance of the numbers in the two pronouns, the one singular, the other plural, rehearsing the same collective ; which would appear harsh in English, though this anomaly is so frequent in the Prophets, that it may be deemed a " *licentia poetica* " of the Hebrew language.

(F) ——— preserved their health.” **רפא** is rendered in the Lexicons “to heal,” and so it usually signifies. But it also signifies, “to preserve health;” or, when God is the agent, “to give health,” as well as to restore it. The Benoni in Kal is remarkably so used, in Exodus xv. 26. If thou wilt diligently hearken to the voice of Jehovah thy God, “and wilt do that which is right in his sight, and wilt give ear to his commandments, and keep all his statutes, I will put none of these diseases upon thee, which I have brought upon the Egyptians, כִּי אֱלֹהָה רָפָאךְ for I Jehovah give thee health,” or “preserve thy health.” The plural noun **רפואה** in Proverbs 1, signifies, not restored, but perfect original health. The noun occurs often in the same book, and is always rendered in our English Bible as a noun substantive, “health,” and as a noun adjective, “sound.” And I believe it will bear the same renderings, in most other places where it is found.

(G) ————— amidst the grievous plagues." So I render בְּחַבְלֵי. I place the Soph-pasuk at אָדָם. The version of the LXX, rightly pointed, gives the same sense, καὶ ἐγένετο ἐγγενέσει ἐν διαβολῇ αἰνθρώπων: and so it is understood by St. Cyril of Alexandria.

(H) ——— to me." I add these words, with Archbishop Newcome, to preserve, with perspicuity, the elegant paronomasia of the original.

(I) ——— the fword shall weary itself." It has been objected to this way of rendering, that, to give this sense, the verb should be **חולת**, not **חולת**, which is masculine; inasmuch as **חרב**, the nominative case of the verb, is a feminine noun; and two other verbs, with which it is connected, in this same sentence are in the feminine form. Not to insist upon the frequent anomaly of the gen-

ders, in things not naturally of either sex, the roots חֹל “to be in pain,” and חָלָה “to be sick, or faint, or weary,” are so nearly allied, that an intercommunity of significations may easily be allowed. And the חָלָה from the root חֹל is the third person præterite singular feminine. I must add, that the version of the LXX, and Syr. confirm this sense of חָלָה in this place. And the Syriac indisputably, and the LXX too according to the Alexandrine text, takes חָרָב as the nominative of the verb^a.

— his diviners.” בְּרוּם Diviners are called בְּרוּם, from the root בָּרוּך, because they affected a solitary ascetic life^b.

This sense of the word בְּרוּם seems of all the most apposite to the context. The word is certainly capable of other senses, and has been differently taken, in this place, by different interpreters; among those, I mean, who adhere to the Hebrew text, as we now read it.

Some render it “branches.” The word certainly signifies, among other things, the arms, or principal branches, of a great tree. But if this be the true rendering here, it must be taken figuratively. And what the figure may be, is not agreed among those, who adopt this rendering. Abarbanel expounds it, of the strong or valiant men; saying, that the chief branches of the people in a kingdom are the valiant men. Rabbi Tanchum explains it, of their children, which he says, are as the branches springing from their fathers. “Branches” is the rendering of the Bishop’s Bible. But in a marginal note the word is expounded of “the villages adjoining to the cities.” This was Kimchi’s interpretation. But, in my judgement, it is set aside by his own remark upon the word; that, in the sense of branches, it is to be understood only of the great limbs of a tree, which issue immediately from the trunk. If branches therefore were the proper rendering, I should think Abarbanel’s, or R. Tanchum’s, the better exposition. Some expound the branches of the turrets and bastions upon the wall; *quea prominent ex muris, ut rami ex trunco.* But in this interpretation the similitude is so far fetched, that it deserves no attention.

Some render the word “membra,” or “artus.” Indeed, it is used for the principal limbs of an animal, as well as of a tree. And this sense is adopted by

^a See Appendix, N° II.

^b See Vitringa, upon If. xvi. 6. and xliv. 25. and Livelye, upon this place.

Arias Montanus, Calvin, Jun. and Trem. and Cocceius. I suppose by the members of Ephraim, these interpreters understood the different orders of the state; the royal family, the army, the magistrates, the priests, the prophets, the commonalty, for these are the limbs of the body politic.

In the English Geneva the word is “bars.” Luther has an equivalent Latin word, “vectes;” and Diodati, “sbarre.” The word may certainly signify stout wooden bars. In Exodus xxv. 13. 14. 15. and in other pieces, it is used for the long wooden poles on which the ark, and other articles of the furniture of the sanctuary, were carried upon the shoulders of the Levites. These bars are understood by some literally, of the bars of the gates of the fortified towns; but by the most learned of those who adopt that rendering, figuratively; of great men, either in the state or in the army. “Magnates, qui vectum in star rempublicam sustinent,” says Calasio. But Grotius, “Vectes recte vocantur, qui armis rempublicam sustentant.” And with him I think Jonathan and Rabbi Solomon agree. For נְבוּרִים is properly a military word. It is somewhat in favour of this interpretation, that the Greek language has a similar figure in the word ἔρματα: which, among its other senses, signifies literally the great wooden rollers, which were placed under vessels drawn up upon the beach, to preserve the keels from the effect of the damp; which would have rotted them, had they rested upon the bare ground. But, figuratively, the same word is used to denote great chieftains; who, by their valour and skill in the art of war, were the defence and stay of the kingdom. Thus in the Iliad, Sarpedon is called ἔρμας πόλης. And he is so called, as the poet tells us, on account of the great force that he led to the defence of Troy, and his personal military prowess^a. And in the Odyssey, after the slaughter of the suitors, Ulysses says to Telemachus, that they two had slain ἔρμας πόλης, giving that name to the whole corps of the slaughtered princes as the bravest of the youth of Ithaca^b.

^a Τρῶας δὲ καλαγηθεν λάβει πάνθος
Ἄσχετον, οὐκ ἐπιειδὸν, ἐπει σφισιν ἔρμα πόλης
Ἐσκει, καὶ ἀλλοδαπός περ οἴνην πολέες γάρ ἄμπει αὐτῷ
Δασὶ ἐπονήι, οὐ δὲ αὐτῷς ἀριστεύεσσε μάχεσθαι. II. II. 548.

^b Ἡμεῖς δὲ ἔρμα πόλης; ἀπέκλαμεν, οὐ μεγάλους
Κέζων εἰν τούτοις.

Od. V. 121.

Diodati understands the word of the whole military strength of the kingdom, consisting both in the works of the fortifications, and the valour of the people. “*fballe. c. tutte le fue forze e difese, così nella fortezza delle città, come nel valor degli huomini.*”

The LXX, and the Syriac, certainly represent a different reading: בְּדַרְיוֹ, instead of בְּדַרְיוֹן. Καὶ ἡσθένησεν ῥομφαία ἐν ταῖς πόλεσιν αὐτῶν, καὶ παθέπαντες ἐν ταῖς χερσὶν αὐτῶν. “The sword is weakened in his cities, and is become inactive in his hands.” Thus the LXX; and the Syriac is to the same effect. In both these versions the sword is taken, not for the sword of the enemy, but for Ephraim’s own sword. The sense is certainly very good, but not better I think, hardly so good as most of the senses brought of the various interpretations of בְּדַרְיוֹן. And as none of the collated MSS, or printed editions, confirm the other reading, I am not inclined to adopt it.

Every one of the interpretations of בְּדַרְיוֹן, as rendering branches, limbs, bars, or diviners, is admissible, and may very well suit the context. I therefore submit them all to the learned reader; but, in my own judgement, that of “diviners” is far the best.

(K) ——— all of one mind.” So I render יחד; unanimiter. See Noldius.

(L) ——— called them — they would not.” I give the pronoun after the first verb, and the nominative before the second, in the plural, for perspicuity; though they are singular in the original, as belonging to a collective, with which the participle הַלְאִים agrees in the plural. The verb קָרָא is plural ^a.

(M) ——— my bowels.” As the word דְּחַמִּים literally rendering bowels, is used, figuratively, for the feelings of compassion, with which, when vehement, the viscera are sensibly affected; I am persuaded, the word here pays back what it borrows, and signifies “my bowels.” Diodati, as it should seem from the reference which he makes, in his note upon this place, to Gen. xlivi. 30. was in the same opinion.

^a See Appendix, N° II.

(N) ——— of cities.” Est nimurum, in posteriore membro, ^{et} אָבָא בָּעֵיר parallelum & synonymum ^{et} אָבָא לֹא, in priore. Fatatum habet vim frequentativam. “ Non soleo urbem intrare; non sum urbicola.” Est etiam in singulis membris pulchra inter se oppositio partium. “ Sum “ Deus & non Homo;” est auxesis in sequenti, & paucum variatur oppositio partium. “ Sum Deus tuus, tecum habitans, sed peculiari modo, extra ordinem, non more hominum. Lowth, Praelect. XIX. To this exposition of that admirable critic, I scruple not to apply, what he himself says of this passage of the Prophet, “ Nihil, opinor, clarius, nihil elegantius.”

(O) ——— himself.” דָּוָא is evidently emphatical here. But the Emphasis would not appear in the translation, without the insertion of “ himself.”

(P) ——— hurry.” It is impossible to render, in English, the full force of the word יְהִרְרוּ. It expresses the rapid motion of birds in the air upon fluttering pinion. The Latin word, “ trepidabunt,” would exactly render it.

(Q) ——— as the sparrow.” בַּצְפּוֹר. As a particular species of bird (the dove) is connected with Assyria, a particular species also must be connected with Egypt. Therefore I take צְפּוֹר in its specific, not in its general sense.

I render “ the sparrow,” and “ the dove;” because the Hebrew nouns, though in the singular number, certainly are to be taken here for the species, not for a single bird of each kind; a flight of sparrows, and a flight of doves. The sparrow and the dove are both birds of very quick motion.

(R) ——— faith Jehovah.” Here the chapter is closed in the Hebrew text, and the Syriac version; and the following verse is given to the next chapter. But the division of the LXX, Vulg. and Chald. which our public translation follows, seems preferable.

(S) ——— the Holy ones.” קָדוֹשִׁים. Even the Jewish expositors, R. Tan-chum and Kimchi, understand this plural word in this place as signifying God: although the former disapproves not altogether the opinion of those, who would understand it of “ Angels.” Among Christian expositors, Lyra, Oecolampadius, Munster, Mercer, Vatablus, understand it, as I do, of the Persons of

the Godhead. Lyra goes farther ; for he takes נָמָן also for an epithet of God. And the apposition of this in the singular, with “ Holy Ones” in the plural, he understands as an intimation of the mystery of the unity of the essence in the plurality of the persons. But in this I cannot follow him. For although I think not lightly of the like argument for the doctrine, drawn from other texts of Scripture, I cannot find it here ; being persuaded that נָמָן is not to be applied to God, but to Judah. It is remarkable, however, that a learned Jew, Kimchi’s father, understood נָמָן here as an attribute of God.

CHAP. XII.

(A) SEE chap. IX. note (F).

(B) ———— matched with the angel.” This I take to be the exact force of the Hebrew מלאך אל. $\pi\varphi\circ\varsigma\tau\circ\alpha\gamma\circ\lambda\circ\sigma$.

(C) ———— and was endued with strength ;” for יְכָל, the later prophets of Soncinum (1486), forty-one MSS of Kennicott’s, and one more originally, read לְכָל. It makes no difference in the sense, but the orthography is certainly more regular.

(D) ———— he had wept.” Of weeping, Archbishop Newcome says, “ we read nothing in Gen. xxxii.” Certainly we read nothing of Jacob’s weeping, upon the occasion of the colluctation at Penuel. But as the weeping and supplicating stand connected here, with the finding of God at Bethel ; it is evident, that this weeping and supplicating were previous to any meeting with God at Bethel : consequently, previous to Jacob’s first meeting with God at Bethel. Now, previous to the first meeting, there certainly was weeping and supplicating. For we read, that previous to that meeting Jacob was “ in distress.”

And

And that God “ answered him in that distress^a.” I agree with Calvin, that the weeping and entreaty, which procured the very extraordinary favour of God’s appearance to Jacob, in a dream at Bethel^b, are mentioned here, as the means by which he obtained that strength, which enabled him to prevail over the angel.

The remark of Luther, upon this extraordinary conflict between Jacob and the person called the angel, is so excellent, that I cannot but subjoin it here.

“ Disputari autem varie solet, qualis ea fuerit lucta. Sed historia ostendit, “ Jacob venisse in certum vitæ discrimen, & totis viribus esse ab antagonista “ ignoto invasum. Itaque viribus corporis ipse quoque contra antagonistam “ est usus, ut defenderet vitam. Non tamen pugnavit corporis viribus tan- “ tum; etiam fides ejus luctata est; ac primum in tam præfenti periculo con- “ sciatus se est, quod divinitus esset iussus redire in terram Canaan. Deinde “ toto pectore arripuit præmissionem in Bethel a domino factam, ubi clare “ promissa est defensio. Cum igitur angeretur, ac ab ignoto hoste totis viribus “ oppugnaretur, etsi viribus suis contra est usus, tamen fortius pugnavit fide; “ intuens præmissionem, & certo statuens Deum, secundum verbum suum, af- “ futurum in tanto periculo, & servaturum. Atque hâc fide vicit Deum: etsi “ enim Christus tentaret Jacob hâc luctâ, tamen præter vel contra verbum “ suum, quo Jacob nixus est, nihil potuit facere.”

(E) ——— with us.” **וְנִמְנָיו.** It is perhaps a question that has never been accurately discussed, in what cases the suffix **וְ** may be taken as the pronoun of the third person singular masculine; whether, when attached to any other words, than the infinitives and third persons singular future of verbs. If to any other words, whether to indeclinables.

(F) ——— his memorial.” **וְכָרְיוֹ.** Houbigant refers the suffixed pronoun not to Jehovah but to Jacob, conceiving that the passage alludes to the name of Israel, given by the angel to Jacob. It must be confessed, that the versions of the LXX, and the Syr. are in favour of this interpretation, which was adopted also in the Bishop’s Bible, ‘Ο δὲ κύριος ὁ Θεὸς ὁ ταντοράτωρ ἔσαι μνημόσιον αὐτῷ. LXX. **οἱ μὲν οὐδὲν ταῦτα μνημόσιαν αὐτῷ.** Syr. If the pro-

^a Gen. xxxv. 3.

^b Gen. xxviii.

noun may be supposed to rehearse Jacob, as these interpreters must have taken it, Houbigant's proposed emendations would however be unnecessary. For his sense, with this reference only of the pronoun, would be more emphatically expressed in the text as it stands, than as altered, without any authority, by that learned and acute, but too adventurous critic. But to the sense I have these objections:

1st. The name of Israel has no reference to יהוה but to נָא. And taking the initial נ in ישָׁרָאֵל as merely formative of the proper name, as I conceive it to be, the exact significance of the name is, "a prince of God."

2d. God himself says this name Jehovah is his memorial; that is his appropriate, perpetual name^a. "And God said moreover unto Moses, thus shalt thou say unto the children of Israel: Jehovah, the God of your fathers, the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob, hath sent me unto you. This is my name for ever, and this my MEMORIAL (זְכָרֵי) unto all generations." Where "this" rehearses "Jehovah" by itself; for the addition, "the God of Abraham," &c. is no part of the name or memorial, but a most gracious declaration of Jehovah's peculiar connection with the fathers of the Israelites. Accordingly, the Psalmist says, "Jehovah is thy name for ever; Jehovah is thy memorial for all generations^b." Then, after a description of the impotence and nothingness of idols, the work of men's hands, the Psalm concludes with animated solemn worship of Jehovah, by the reiteration of this name.

"House of Israel, bless ye the Jehovah. House of Aaron, bless ye the Jehovah.

"House of Levi, bless ye the Jehovah. Ye that fear Jehovah, bless ye the Jehovah.

"Blessed be Jehovah in Sion. Inhabitants of Jerusalem praise Jah^c."

Where I observe by the way, that wherever נָא is prefixed to Jehovah as the accusative case after a verb, it points to the name "Jehovah," as the memorial. "Bless him who is the Jehovah." I have therefore always expressed it in my translation by "the."

3d. I observe, that the proper name of a man, or of any created being, is never called its "memorial." This is applied solely and exclusively to the essential name of the self-existent God.

^a Exodus iii. 15.

^b Ps. cxxxv. 13.

^c 19. 20. 21.

(G) ——— charity and justice." See chapter VI. notes (D), (F), and (G).

(H) A trafficker of Canaan."

Δὴ τότε Φοίνιξ ἡλθεν, εἰνῆς ἀπειλήμα εἰδὼς,
Τρεψάτης, ὃς δὴ πολλοὶ κακοὶ ὀνθρώποισιν ἔστρεψεν.

Od. Σ. 288.

"Ludit oratio in ambiguo," says Houbigant; with whom I agree. For the Hebrew word **בָּנָן** is both a proper name and an appellative, rendering a merchant. And to preserve the ambiguity in my translation, I join the appellative and the proper name together. By giving the proper name without the appellative, or the appellative without the proper name, the whole spirit of the original would be lost to the English reader. All the antient versions, except the Chaldee, give the proper name.

(I) ——— upon over-reaching." **רָשַׁב** The word expresses oppression, either by violence, or fraudulent extortion. **Πλεονεκτήμα** in any way. "Cum pide infert injurias." Luther. "—— amat fraudare." Castalio.

(K) Although ——— iniquity." To this effect the Syriac. And see chap. IX. note (F).

(L) ——— coming upon." This I take to be the force of **הָיָה**, expressing the controul of the inspiring Spirit over the Prophets.

"—— ille fatigat

"Os rabidum, fera corda domans, fingitque premendo." AEn. VI. 79.

Upon many occasions there seems to have been much reluctance and renitence upon the part of the Prophet.

(M) ——— he kept watch." **שָׁמַר** — excubias egit. In the office of a shepherd.

(N) ——— tended." **נִשְׁמַר**. Allusion to a shepherd tending a flock.

CHAP. XIII.

(A) ——— in their great wisdom." So I render כתבונם pro suâ scilicet sapientiâ." Observe, that the reading כתבונם, instead of בתבונם, is confirmed by a great number of the old editions, among them by the text of Minchath Shai, by 31 MSS. of Kennicott's collation, and by 85 in all of De Rossi's.

(B) ——— molten images." I am perswaded the noun substantive, though in the singular, is used as a collective, and renders a plural sense.

(C) ——— their finishing is, that they say." In the printed text we find Athnach under the word כלה; which necessarily makes that the final word of the clause, and a new sentence begins with אלה. Most interpreters, taking up with this division, render with our public translation, "all of it the work "of the craftsmen; they say of them ——." Where "all of it" is given to answer to כלה. Expositors find great emphasis in "all of it," expressing, as they conceive, that there was nothing in the idol beyond the form, which the image received from the hand of the artificer; no mind, will, understanding, or power. And this sense, it must be confessed, would be very apposite to the general subject, if it could be brought, without violence, out of the Hebrew words. But for this purpose the word, instead of כלה, should have been כליל, from the root כלל, "to bring to perfection, to complete," finish, in a good sense. For this noun כליל is the word which signifies totality, if we may so speak, in the concrete. Put in apposition with any noun substantive, it signifies, that the thing, named by that noun substantive, is, in its state of totality, nothing wanting, the whole of it. As בנד כליל תכלת^a. From the same root כלל comes indeed another noun כל, which signifies totality in the

^a Num. iv. 6.

abstract. And this noun prefixed to substantives, or with affixed pronouns, may seem nearly equivalent to the former; for it often renders “all of —” the thing named by the subsequent noun substantive, or rehearsed by the affixed pronoun, as **כָל אֶחָיו רֹשֶׁת שָׁנָאָהוּ**. “All the brethren of the poor man hate “him.” — **הַגּוֹי כָלָוּ** — this nation all of it^b.” It is to be observed, however, that the two nouns, thus used, are materially different. **כָל** renders the aggregate of many: the collected total of what naturally exists in detached parts. Whereas **כָלְלָה** renders the complete entire state of an individual thing. And this is the meaning wanted here, according to this exposition. The word therefore cannot be taken here as the noun **כָל** with the feminine affix **ה**, rehearsing the feminine noun substantive **מְסֻכָּה**. The Masoretes indeed have pointed the word, as they have done in other places, where the affix **ה** is used, as they pretend, by an enallage for the masculine **ו**; viz. **כָלָה**. In three of the texts, where they pretend to find this enallage^c, the affix seems to be really feminine. For it rehearses Moab, i. e. the land of Moab; which is feminine as a land, masculine as a people, and is rehearsed by other masculine and feminine pronouns indiscriminately, in the same texts. In the other passages the MSS vary; so that the existence of the anomaly in the genuine Hebrew text is doubtfull. But this by the way. The Masoretes introduce it here, conceiving that the word rehearsed is the masculine **מְעֻשָּׂה**, not the feminine **מְסֻכָּה**. But this will make no difference; for **מְסֻכָּה** and **מְעֻשָּׂה** here are the same thing under different names. But the objection to this exposition of the word **כָלָה** is, that **כָל** cannot render the all of an individual: and the individual idol, brought to its perfection by the hand of the artist, is the thing in question here, according to this exposition of the word, and of the context.

Hence I am perswaded that the final **ה** is no affix, but belongs to the word itself; which I take to be a verbal from the root **כָלָה**; which signifies, to finish in a good, bad, or middle sense. The verbal I would point **כָלָה**, and take in its common and most obvious sense of the “act of finishing.” Then Athnach being carried back, and placed under the preceding word **חַרְשִׁים** (instead of Tiphcha, which, with its attendant Merca, I expunge), that the clause may end with that word, the following words make a clause by themselves; namely, **כָלָה לְהַם הַם אָמְרִים זָבְחֵי אָדָם עֲנִילִים יְשָׁקָק**. In this clause the noun substan-

^a Prov. xix. 7.

^b Mal. iii. 9.

^c If. xv. 3. xvi. 7. and Jer. xlvi. 38.

tive **כָּלָת** is the nominative of the verb substantive understood ; **לְהַ** is a dative after the verb substantive understood ; and **הַם אָמְרִים** is a nominative absolute, exactly answering to the ablative absolute in Latin, when the ablative absolute expresses at once, as it often does, both the means by which, and the time when, of the action ; and the clause following **אָמְרִים** stands as the accusative after that transitive participle. “ *Finis [est] illis, dicentibus, Vitulos osculantor, qui victimas humanas immolant.* ”

(D) It may seem extraordinary, that we find it no where mentioned in the sacred history, by whom the practice was introduced of sacrificing men to the calves, the pretended emblems of the true God, if so great an abomination ever prevailed. But this would appear an objection of no great weight to the interpretation I have given of the Prophet's words, which, however hitherto overlooked, is the only one they will naturally bear ; if the prevalence of the practice were of necessity implied in the words of the Prophet so interpreted. But it is possible, that the calves themselves were never so worshipped. But that the zeal for idolatry was so great with some of the latter kings, that they made it a condition, upon which alone they would tolerate the worship of Jehovah in the calves, that the worshipper should join in the offering of human sacrifices to Moloch, or some other idol. For if any of the Kings of Israel issued an edict of toleration, under such a condition ; he said, in effect, “ let ‘the sacrificers of men kiss the calves.’ ” It is true, no such measure is mentioned in the sacred History. But the silence of the History is certainly no confutation of any thing, to which the Prophets clearly allude as a fact. For the history of the kingdom of Israel, under the different usurpers, after the fall of Zedekiah, the son of the second Jeroboam, is so concise and general ; that we know little of the detail of it, but what is to be gathered from allusions. We have the names of the Kings in succession, the length of their reigns, and their principal exploits. But we know nothing of the particulars, but what we gather from the Prophets, or from the more circumstantial history of the collateral reigns in the kingdom of Judah. Insomuch that human victims may have been offered to the calves, or the worshippers of the calves may have been compelled to dip their hands in the blood of Moloch's victims ; though no evidence of either practice remains, but this allusion of the Prophet Hosea ;

which

which leaves some degree of doubt between the two. Sacrifices to the calves themselves seem to me the more probable object of the allusion.

When it is recollect^{ed}, that Solomon himself built a temple to Moloch, and that Ahab introduced the worship of the Tyrian Baal, in the kingdom of Samaria; and that both these idols were appeased with infant blood; there is too much reason to believe, that the practice must have begun early in both kingdoms; although it probably was late, before it came to a height in either. And yet the first mention of it, in the History of the kingdom of Samaria, is when the sacred writer closes that history, with an enumeration of the crimes which provoked the judgement of God, and brought on its ruin^a. Nevertheless, it is certain, that this abominable custom was of older date, and perhaps of not much older date, in the kingdom of Samaria, than in that of Judah^b. For, in the kingdom of Judah, Ahaz is the first King, of whom we read, that he adopted the practice. And it is mentioned, as one of the things in which he followed the example of the Kings of Israel. “ — Ahaz — did not that which was right in the sight of Jehovah, like David his father. “ But he walked in the way of the Kings of Israel, insomuch that he passed his son through the fire, according to the abominations of the heathen — c.”

I am aware, that Dr. Wells endeavours to draw the contrary conclusion from this very passage of the Book of Kings; namely, that the practice of human sacrifices began in the kingdom of Judah first, and was introduced in the kingdom of Israel by Hoshea, the last king. The Hebrew particle וְ, which I render “ insomuch that;” Dr. Wells, following our public translation, “ yea, and —,” understands as introducing a particular, in which Ahaz followed not, but went beyond, the Kings of Israel. And I admit, that he went beyond them, but still following their example. He went beyond them in their own way. And the circumstance, in which he went beyond them, was this; that he sacrificed his own son, which is not recorded of any of the Kings of Israel. The amount of the passage therefore giving the particle וְ its full force is this: “ But he walked in the ways of the Kings of Israel, in such degree, [or to such a length,] that he passed his own son, &c.”

^a 2 Kings xvii. 17.

^b See Appendix, N^o II.

^c 2 Kings xvi. 2. §.

The notion, that human sacrifices were introduced in the kingdom of Samaria by Hoshea, is a conceit of Dr. Wells, founded upon nothing more certain, than his own arbitrary division of the Book of Hosea, mentioned in my Preface. According to that division, the first eight verses of this thirteenth chapter belong to a prophecy, beginning with the 11th verse of chapter VII. the whole of which was delivered in the reign of Hoshea. And since the edict, that the sacrificers of men should kiss the calves, must be understood of some injunction of human sacrifices, which took place about the time of the utterance of this prophecy; it must be understood of an injunction taking place in the reign of Hoshea. And upon these grounds, the infamy of the introduction of those sanguinary rites is thrown, by Dr. Wells, upon that reign.

But the character of Hoshea, though none of the best, is vindicated, however, from this aspersion, by the express testimony of the sacred Historian; who writes, that “Hoshea, the son of Elah, began to reign over Israel in Samaria nine years. And he did that which was evil in the eyes of Jehovah, “but not as the Kings of Israel that were before him.”

Hoshea’s doings, therefore, were not good, yet they were less bad than those of his predecessors. Whereas, if the abomination of human sacrifices had not been introduced by them, and he introduced it; he, it is evident, was worse than they. Dr. Wells eludes this argument by a great stroke of verbal criticism. For he says, that in the disjunctive proposition “Hosea did evil—but not as the former Kings,” the particle “but” is to be understood, not by way of extenuation, but of aggravation; that Hosea was worse than they; and, by being worse, was not like them. And thus having turned the meaning of this plain text of the sacred Historian upside down, he triumphs, as “having set a matter in a clear light, not afore duly taken notice of by any writer, and yet of importance to be rightly understood.” The matter is, indeed, of importance to be rightly understood. And it is of great importance to vindicate the sacred text from these puerile subtleties of criticism, which leave plain readers at a loss, which way to take the most familiar expressions, which, by the usage of mankind, have but one meaning. When two things are thus contrasted by the disjunctive “but,”

^a 2 Kings xvii. 1. 2.

that,

that, of which the likeness is denied, is always set forth as the inferior, whether for good or for bad, in that with respect to which the comparison is made. Thus if it be said, that Livia is beautifull, but not like Julia; the meaning is, that Livia though beautifull is inferior in beauty to Julia. Hippia is lascivious, but not like Messalina. The sense is, that Hippia is the less lascivious of the two. So when it is said, that “Hoshea did evil, but not like the former Kings;” the certain and single meaning is, that he was less evil in his doings than they. It is true, if we reverse the meaning, and say, Livia is more beautifull than Julia; Hippia more lascivious than Messalina; Hoshea worse than his predecessors; a disparity, though of the contrary kind, will still subsist, and dissimilitude might be predicated in the same terms, if the expression were used for the first time. But the custom of speech, in all languages, is the other way. Dr. Wells was a man of great piety, and of found learning. But his criticisms are sometimes more subtle than judicious.

Upon the whole, it may be concluded with certainty, from this text of Hosea; that, in the latter period of the monarchy of the ten tribes, the practice of human sacrifices came to such a height, and was so much countenanced by the kings and rulers, that it was either enjoined as an essential in the worship even of the calves; or required of their worshipers, with regard to other idols, as the only condition upon which even that shadow of the true worship would be tolerated. The time, when this took place, cannot be determined with certainty; I think it must have been as early as the reign of Menahem; for, from the expressions in 2 Kings xvi. 3, we may gather, that Ahaz had the example of more kings of Israel than one or two, for the detestable rites, which he introduced among his own subjects.

(E) ——— I sustained thee.” יְדַעְתִּיךְ i. e. literally, “ I knew thee,” i. e. I acknowledged thee, as my peculiar people, by my watchfull care of thee. I was attentive to thee, protecting thee in all dangers, and supplying all thy wants. I know no word in our language, that so well expresses the sense of the original in this place, as that I have chosen, “ I sustained.” ἐποίησανόν σε, with equal exactness, expresses the sense in Greek; and these are the words of the LXX. The Syriac has Whence it has been conjectured, that was the reading of the copies, from which those two versions were made.

made. The conclusion, however, is rather precarious; for, with regard to the LXX, their version expresses what must be allowed to be the sense, whichever way they read. And it is hardly a sufficient ground to alter the Hebrew text, that, if we were translating back again from the Greek into Hebrew, without a previous knowledge of the actual state of the text, we should render ἐπίσημόν σε by רעתיך, as the word literally answering to it. As for the Syriac, I see indeed no reason why he should use the word פָּתַח; if he found יְדֻתִּךְ, in his Hebrew text; since the word יְדִי has the same latitude of meaning in the Syriac dialect, as in the Hebrew itself. But the letters פ and י resemble each other in the Syriac alphabet almost as nearly, as in the Hebrew. And if a corruption, by error of the transcriber, is to be supposed in either; it is much more likely to have taken place in the Syriac, than in the Hebrew. It is more probable, that the error of a scribe has changed פָּתַח into פָּתַח; in the Syriac, than יְדֻתִּךְ into רעתיך in the Hebrew. For this may be laid down as a general maxim, deserving the attention of modern critics, who are often over hasty to correct the text upon the authority, or supposed authority, of the versions; that where the sense of both readings is the same, as is the case here, and the text and the version may be made to agree, by a slight alteration in either; the suspicion of corruption ought rather to fall upon the version, than the Hebrew text; considering the scrupulous care, carried even the length of superstition, with which the latter was watched and guarded by the Jews. The argument for a facility of emendation, taken from the resemblance of certain letters in the Hebrew alphabet, goes evidently the contrary way; when the various reading, deduced from the authority of the versions, is not confirmed by a single MS. or old edition, as is the case again here. The more the פ and י of the Hebrew alphabet are alike, the more incredible it is, that all the MSS. now extant should give יְדֻתִּךְ, as they do, if רעתיך were the true reading; or, if indeed it had been a reading at all, when the Syriac version, or that of the LXX was made.

Jonathan, in this place, is so paraphrastic, that he may seem to be no authority for either reading. For, like the LXX, he gives what is the plain sense of the passage, whichever way it be redded. But I think the comparison of this text, and Jonathan's Targum with another text, and Onkelos's Targum affixed

afford a very strong argument for the text as it stands יְדֻעַתִּיךְ . In Deut. ii. 7. Moses says, “ For Jehovah thy God hath blessed thee in all the works of thy hands; he knoweth thy walking through this great wilderness.” יְדֻעַ לְכַתֵּךְ אֶת הַמִּדְבָּר הַגָּל הַה . This passage, and the passage we are upon of Hosea, are much alike. The subject is the same; the wandering of the Israelites in the wilderness. The expressions are very nearly the same. In Hosea, “ God knew thee ——.” In Deuteronomy, “ God knoweth thy walking.” The expression of Hosea, “ God knoweth thee,” is thus paraphrased by Jonathan: אָנָּא סְפִקּוֹת צְוָרְכֵהוּ בְּמִדְבָּרָא . “ I supplied their necessaries in the wilderness.” The expression, “ God knoweth thy walking ——,” in Deuteronomy, is thus paraphrased by Onkelos: סְפָקֵ לְךָ צְרָכָךְ . “ He supplied thy necessities.” It will hardly bear a doubt, that it must have been the same Hebrew word in both places, which these learned paraphrasts have expounded by the same Chaldee words. But, in Deuteronomy ii. 7. the word is עַד, without any variety of the Samaritan text, or of a single MS, and confirmed by all the versions. We must conclude, therefore, that the true reading, in this text of Hosea, is the word יְדֻעַתִּיךְ , from the same root. And yet, as was observed with respect to the words of the LXX, ἐπίδημον σε, if we were to translate these Chaldee words, which render “ the supply of necessities,” back again into Hebrew, in either place, we should be apt to resort to the root רָעַה , rather than עַד .

I have dwelt the longer upon this passage, because I know of no instance in which an emendation, upon the bare authority of versions, without a single MS, and without any imperious exigence of the place, may seem more plausible than this. And yet in this, even the apparent consent of versions fails. It is otherwise indeed when the textual reading, and the reading inferred from ancient versions, differ materially in sense; and where a strong *exigentia loci* appears to be on the side of the versions. In such cases, I would submit to the versions, even without MSS.

(F) —— “ parching thirst.” תְּלָאֹבָת לְאָב occurs no where in the Bible, nor any of its derivatives except this noun; nor this noun except in this place. I take the noun to be plural; and the correct orthography to be תְּלָאֹבּוֹת . For the latter prophets of Soncinum of 1486, with twenty-two MSS. of Kennicott’s, and three more originally, give the perfect word תְּלָאֹבּוֹת .

The Bible of Soncinum of 1488, and of Brescia 1494, the latter prophets of Pefaro 1516, the Basil Bible (Munster's 2d) 1586, the Bible of Hale 1720, with thirty-nine MSS. of Kennicott's, give תלאות, without the first ג. Five MSS. only of Kennicott's, and no edition, give תלאכת, without either ג. It is pretty certain, therefore, that תלאות is the true form of the word. If the root **לָאֵב** signify to be thirsty, this noun, with the initial heemantic **ת**, must be from the hiphil of the verb, and must signify "causes of thirst." And a land of such causes must be a land which, from the nature of the soil, and other circumstances, affording no water, produces excruciating thirst in animals. The plural number is used only to give intensity to the signification; which I have endeavoured to express by the epithet "parching."

(G) ——— and they were fed to the full." I sustained thee, and in consequence of my sustaining, they were fed to the full. I remove the soph-pasuk from the word תלאות ושבש.

It may perhaps somewhat illustrate these two verses, the 5th and 6th, if I exhibit them, in what I conjecture to have been the metrical arrangement.

5 אַנְיִידְעַתִּיךְ בְּנֶדֶבְּרָה
בָּאָרֶץ תְּלָאוֹבּוֹת כְּמַרְעִיתָם וַיִּשְׁבַּע :
6 שְׁבָעָנוּ וַיְרַם לְבָם
עַל כֵּן שְׁכָחָנוּ :

The construction of the parallels is somewhat singular. In the second hemistich the verb יִדְעַתְּהֶם, with the suffix of the third person plural, is understood; to answer יִדְעַתִּיךְ, with the suffix of the second person singular, in the former. And the second hemistich, of which the three first words (with יִדְעַתְּהֶם understood) constitute a complete parallel to the first, takes an additional word, the verb וַיִּשְׁבַּע, as a close, antagonised to the verb יִדְעַתִּיךְ, in the first hemistich. And this verb is taken up again, with much animation, at the beginning of the next hemistich, carrying on the sense, and connecting the second distich with the first, and forming a quaternion of the two. The peculiar character of Hosea still prevails, the commata; and yet the commata, with singular art, are thrown into a period.

——— for that very reason." This I take to be the force of **עַל כֵּן**.

(H)

(H) ——— by the way side." **לְדָרֶךְ** **לְ**. "close by the way," not "in," or "upon it."

(I) ——— I will lye upon the watch." **אָשָׁר**. the first person singular future kal of the verb **אָשָׁר**. "Infidiabor;" and to this effect the Chaldee and Arias Montanus.

(K) ——— upon the spot." This I take to be in this place the force of **בָּשָׁם**; "there," viz. upon the spot where I meet them.

(L) ——— wild beast." The margin of our English Bible gives "beast of the field," as a more literal translation of the Hebrew **חַיָּת הַשְׂדָה**. But I think "wild beast" renders the idea of the original more adequately. For the "beast of the field," i. e. of the open country, is so called, as distinguished from the tame domesticated beast, that lives in inclosures and stalls, and associates, in towns and houses, with man. The distinction of the savage character is better expressed by the epithet "wild" than by the substantive "of" "the field."

(M) ——— shall tear them limb from limb." **תִּבְקֻעַם**. "Cleave them," or "rip them." The verb expresses a violent distraction and severing of united parts in any manner; and is to be differently rendered, with regard to the particular agent and patient. When the agent is a wild beast, and the patient the beast's prey, it must be tearing "limb from limb." "Tearing," by itself, is inadequate.

(N) It is thy destruction ——— thee." **שְׁחַתְּךָ יִשְׂרָאֵל כִּי בְּעֹזֶךָ**. In the grammatical construction of these words, I differ not greatly from the learned Jews, R. Tanchum and R. Nissim. The proper name, "Israel," is evidently a vocative, and is to be taken apart by itself. The four other words form a sentence, with the verb substantive understood. The three words, **כִּי בְּעֹזֶךָ**, with an ellipsis which must be supplied, make a clause, which stands as the nominative case before the verb substantive understood; and **שְׁחַתְּךָ** is a noun substantive with an affix, which stands as a second nominative after the verb substantive understood. The supply of the ellipsis in the nominative clause is

obvious and easy, and the order of construction of the complete sentence will be this: **כִּי בַּי** [הִיּוֹ]**כָּל אֲשֶׁר** **בַּשְׁׁוֹרֵךְ** **יִשְׂרָאֵל** “That ‘in me is [every thing which is] for thy help [is] thy destruction, O ‘Israel.’” Rabbi Tanchum and Rabbi Nissim (as he is cited by Abarbanel) take **שְׁׁוֹרֵךְ**, and the clause **כִּי בַּי** **בַּשְׁׁוֹרֵךְ**, as the nominative cases. But they supply the ellipsis in the nominative clause very differently. R. Nissim, as I gather from his paraphrase, as it is stated by Abarbanel, in this manner; **שְׁׁחַתְךָ** **הַטְּחַשֵּׁבָה** **זֹאת** **כִּי בַּי** **תִּמְדֵּר** **אֲשֶׁר** **בַּשְׁׁרֵךְ**: And R. Tanchum to the same effect. Both understand the sentiment to be, that the cause of the destruction of Israel was his presuming upon God’s readiness to help him. They hardened themselves in their corrupt practices, in the confidence that God would never give them up; that, notwithstanding the severity of his threatenings, he would interpose, as upon so many occasions he before had done, to rescue them from their enemies, when things came to an extremity. The passage, thus understood, is a cool reflection upon the fatal effect of God’s kindness upon the perverse minds of the Israelites. But I rather take it as an awefull threatening of dereliction, delivered in terms pathetically expressive of commiseration, according to the explanation which I have given in note ("). I have much less to supply, to bring out this sense, than is necessary for the purpose of the Jewish expositors; and the ellipsis seems easier, and more natural in my way, than in theirs.

(O) Where ——.” **אָהָיו**: All the antient versions give the interrogative “where?” And yet we find the authority only of a single MS, and that none of the best, for the transposition of the letters to make the interrogative **אִיהָ** in its usual form; which could hardly be, if that were the true form of the word in this place. But it is remarkable, that the LXX, the Syr. Aquila, give **אָהָיו** again, in the 14th verse, where **אָהָיו** can be nothing but the first person singular future of the verb substantive: and is so rendered by Symmachus, Vulg. and St. Jerome, and in effect by Jonathan; who, instead of “I shall be,” in the first person, puts as usual, “My word shall be,” in the third. Hence I think it may with certainty be concluded, that **אָהָיו**; as well as **אָהָה**, may ask the question about place; and that where the former occurs, it may be either the interrogative adverb, or the verb substantive future, as may best suit the context. The true orthography of the second interrogative I take to be **אִיְפּוֹא**. And the force of it is, “where is he *now*?” in this critical moment of danger.

This

This force of **אָנָה** is expressed, though not adequately, by the Syr. Vulg. and Jonathan. I conceive, the word asks the question about time; but involving a repetition of the interrogation about place.

(P) ————— forsooth." This I take to be the force of *r* prefixed in **רַעַמָּה**:

(Q) Here at **צְפָנָה** I place the soph-pasuk, and connect the six following words with the next verse.

(R) ——— he is of the thoughtless race.” **הוּא בֶן לֹא חָכָם**. Literally, — he is a son not wise.” My rendering may seem, at first sight, paraphrastic ; but, upon examination, I think it will be found to give neither more nor less, than the just sense of the original. **חָכָם**, as a noun, is properly *oīȳx̄iv̄os*, one that has all his wits about him, ever heedfull of his situations, vigilant, and provident against dangers, even remote. **לֹא חָכָם** describes the stereosis of *oīȳx̄iv̄os*: one of a contrary turn of mind ; regardless, not only of remote consequences, but even of his present situation ; thoughtless, and secure, in imminent dangers. This character, as it may be best expressed in our language, is “ thoughtlessness.” The word “ son,” as it is used here, always describes an individual as belonging to a class, distinguished by a certain occupation or character, and considered as a particular race or family. And conversely, the principal or head of that class is called, in the Bible, “ the Father.” I cannot find words, in the English language, more exactly rendering the ideas corresponding to the Hebrew words, than those I have used.

(S) ————— the aperture, or breach." **מִשְׁבֵּר**: The passage between the bones of the pelvis burst open by the throes of labour. *Collum Uteri. Vitrunga: ad If. xxxvii. 3.*

(T) From the power of Hell ——." The Hebrew, שָׂאֵל; the Greek, *Aδης*; the Latin, Orcus; and the English, Hell; are words of one and the same import, signifying

signifying the place appointed for the habitation of departed souls, in the interval between death and the general resurrection. The word **הַשְׁאָלָה** describes this place as the object of universal enquiry, the unknown mansion, about which all are anxiously inquisitive. The Latin, “Orcus,” names it as a place enclosed within an impassable fence (*ερκος*); the Greek, “*Ἄδης*,” and the English, Hell, describe it by the property of invisibility; for nothing more is included in the natural meaning of those words. In the New Testament, two words are indiscriminately rendered, in our English Bible, by the word “Hell;” *Ἄδης* and *Γέεννα*: the latter, a word of Hebrew origin, transplanted into the Greek language, as the appropriate name of the place of the damned; which was generally so called by the Jews of the Apostolic age. This use of the word Hell, in the English New Testament, has imposed a sense upon it, quite foreign to its etymology, and abhorrent from its more general application.

The **הַשְׁאָלָה** of the Old Testament, and the Hades of the New, is indeed the Hell to which our Lord Jesus Christ, according to the Apostle’s Creed, descended. It is the Paradise, to which he conveyed the foul of the repentant thief. It is the place whither his soul went and preached, to the souls, not in prison, as we read in our English Bible, but *ἐν φυλακῇ* “in safe keeping,” (if that text of St. Peter 1. iii. 19. is to be understood literally, and I know not how it can be understood otherwise,) which one while *had been* disobedient (*απειθήσασι πάθει*); but, as the expression “one while *had been*” implies, were at length recovered from that disobedience, probably by the preaching of Noah, and before their death had been brought to repentance and faith in the Redeemer to come. To these souls our Lord Jesus Christ went in his soul and preached. But what could he preach to them? Not repentance. They had repented of their disobedience, before they were separated from the body by death, or they had not been sound in the bundle of life. But, if he went and proclaimed to them (*ἐκήρυξεν*) the great tidings that he had actually offered the sacrifice of their redemption, and was now about to enter into glory; this was a preaching, that would give new animation and assurance to their hope of the consummation, in due season, of their bliss. And this, by the way, I take to be the true sense of this text of St. Peter.

Another inaccuracy obtains in our English Bible; the Hebrew **הַשְׁאָלָה** (Sheol) being perpetually in the Old Testament, and the Greek “*Ἄδης*” (Hades) sometimes in the New, rendered improperly by the word “Grave,” which neither signifies.

fies. The Hebrew word for the Grave is קְבָרָה, and the Greek τάφος. The Hebrew names of Hell and the Grave never are confounded, nor the Greek, by the sacred writers. No two things, indeed, can be more distinct. Hell is the mansion of the departed spirit; the Grave is the receptacle of the dead body. Hell is often personified, as it is here, by the sacred writers; the Grave, never. The boldest personifications of Hell, which occur to my memory, are in two passages of the Apocalypse.

“ — I looked, and behold a pale horse; and his rider was seated upon him: his name was DEATH, and HELL followed with him^a.”

And again,

“ — And Death and Hell gave up the deceased that were in them; and they were judged, every one according to his works, and Death and Hell were cast into the lake of fire^b.”

I am inclined to think, but I suggest it only to the examination of the learned, without venturing to assert, that Death and Hell are always conjointly personified by the sacred writers, never one without the other.

But it is to be observed, that when either is personified, it is always in the character of an enemy of man, and an antagonist of the Saviour; which is easily understood of Death, but may seem extraordinary of the other; if what has been maintained be true, that Hell, in the true import of the word, as equivalent to Sheol, Hades, or Orcus, is a place of rest and comfort to the departed souls of the Saints; which is most certainly the case, insomuch, that to be in this place is mentioned by St. Paul, as “a being with the Lord^c.” Nevertheless, the happiness of this place is certainly full assurance of hope, rather than fruition. It is a place perhaps of seclusion from the external world; and the state of the departed Saints, while they continue there, is a condition of unfinished bliss, in which the souls of the justified would not have remained for any time (if indeed they had ever entered it), had not Sin introduced Death. It is a state, therefore, consequent upon Death; consequent, therefore, upon Sin, though no part of the punishment of it. And the resurrection of the Saints is often described, as an enlargement of them by our Lord’s power, from confinement in a place, not of punishment, but of inchoate enjoyment only. “ Our Lord will break the gates of brass, and cut the bars of iron in sunder,”

^a Rev. vi. 8.

^b xx. 13. 14.

^c 2 Cor. v. 8. and Phil. i. 23.

and

and set at liberty “ his prisoners of hope.” And when this place of safe keeping is personified, it is, consistently with these notions of it, represented as one of the enemies which Christ is to subdue.

In this passage Death and Hell are personified very remarkably. And the two persons are threatened each with an incurable disease, causing speedy death, to be inflicted by God the Saviour.

(V) ——— thy pestilence.” For **דבריך**, the latter Prophets of Soncinum (1486); the Bible of Soncinum (1488); the Bible of Brescia (1494); ninety-seven MSS. of Kennicott’s, among them the oldest and the best, one more originally; twenty-five MSS. of De Rossi’s, and four more originally, give **דברך** in the singular. This I adopt as unquestionably the true reading. The versions (although all mis-translate, except Symmachus, St. Jerome, and the Vulgate) all give the noun in the singular, except Aquila, and the fifth Greek. **דבר**, in the sense of the plague, pestilence, or destruction, is never used in the plural number.

(W) ——— thy burning plague.” **קטבך** occurs only in four places; of which this is one. The other three are, Deut. xxxii. 24. Ps. xci. 6. and If. xxviii. 2. In Isaiah, the connections of the word are not such as to point out any specific meaning. It is put in apposition with **שׁער**; but whether as an adjective agreeing with **שׁער** as a substantive; or as a substantive in the genitive case after **שׁער**; or a noun substantive, with which **שׁער** agrees as an adjective; appears not from any thing in the context. All that can be collected from this passage is, that **קטב** is something which may be connected, either as cause, effect, or concomitant, with tempest. But in Ps. xci. it is connected, as it is here, with **דבר**; and properties are ascribed to each, which shew the difference between the two; and, since it is certain that **דבר** is some kind of mortal disease, lead to the precise meaning of each. The Holy Psalmist, speaking of Jehovah’s protection of Messiah, says to Messiah, “ Thou shalt not be afraid for the terror by night, for the arrow that flieth “ by day: **נדבר באפל יהלך מקטב שוד צהרים**. For the *Deber* that goeth on in “ darkness, for the *Cheteb* which wasteth (or depopulates) at noon day.” No one, in the least conversant with the stile of sacred poetry, can for a moment doubt, that *Deber* and *Cheteb* are things of the same kind. But *Deber* is a disease;

disease; *Cheteb* therefore is a disease too. And, by the description here given of each, *Deber* is the putrid plague fever, which usually makes its fatal progress in the dead of night, while the patient is in sleep. *Cheteb* is the dreadfull solstitial disease, which in the tropical climates, and, in some rare instances, in our own, in the extreme heat of harvest smites suddenly in the open air and at noon-day, and kills either at once, or in a few minutes, by a putrescence of the juices, of the living body, almost instantaneous. The disease is so rare in these high latitudes, that we have no name for it in our language; nor had the Greeks in theirs. Our public translation, therefore, is content with the very general word “destruction,” and all the Greek interpreters give strange paraphrases.

The sense of the word, which we deduce from the ninety-first Psalm, is confirmed by the use of it in Deuteronomy xxxii. 24. where it is mentioned along with שָׁׁרֶשֶׁת, another malignant inflammatory disease.

And now it will be easy to expound the שׁׁעַר קְטַב of Isaiah; though, for want of a word to render קְטַב, it is impossible to translate it. שׁׁעַר קְטַב is the tempest, which often happens in the season of those extreme heats, in which the קְטַב takes place; and is therefore a concomitant of the *Cheteb*.

“Solstitial tempest” would perhaps be the best English for the phrase; not that קְטַב signifies solstice; but it might be put in this place to mark the season, when such tempests usually take place; which is, in fact, the solstice.

Of the four passages in which the word occurs, this text of Hosea now remains. And since the words *Deber* and *Cheteb* are connected here, just as they are in the 91st Psalm; it cannot reasonably be doubted, that they are to be taken here, each in the same sense as in the Psalm; especially as no sense of either can be found, which better suits this place. I give therefore “burning plague,” for קְטַב, not as an adequate expression, but the best I can devise.

The LXX render קְטַב by *άνθησιν*; and the Syriac by a word of the same meaning. Others would have render *דְּבָרֶךָ* render *άνθησιν*. And, if this were admitted, it would follow that קְטַב must be something of the same kind, and would not be ill rendered by the same word. And the learned Rivetus, in support of the LXX, goes so far as to say, “Quicquid pertundendo & perfodiendo repente “penetrat impetu vehementissimo, ut cuspis acuta solet, id Ebræis nomine illo “[nomine קְטַב] designatur.” Of what Hebrews does he speak? Of the

sacred writers? I demand the place, where any one of them applies the word in that sense, or in any sense but as the name of a disease? No such place is to be found. Are the Rabbinical writers the Hebrews, of whom Rivetus speaks? What he says, can be said of no other Hebrews. But to interpret the Hebrew of the Holy Bible, by the use of words in the Rabbinical writings, is just what it would be, to attempt to explain Homer's words by the senses of words in modern Greek.

As to the word **דְבָר**, I deny that in the Bible-Hebrew it ever signifies “a sting.” The noun **דְבִירָה** indeed signifies a bee; and bees have stings. But neither **דְבִירָה**, nor any other word derived from the root **דְבָר**, signifies the sting of a bee in any one passage in the Bible. But we are told, that in the Arabic language, *Daborah* signifies “the spur of a fighting cock,” a sense which the Greek *κέντηστος* also bears. Granted: but why must we resort to the Arabic for new senses of Hebrew words, when the well known genuine Hebrew sense suits the purpose of the sacred writer full as well, if not better? Whoever takes the trouble to examine the antient versions, in the four passages where the word **קְטַב** occurs, will find that the translators were put to their shifts for a specific meaning; they had no discernment of the true meaning of the word, and their renderings are of no authority.

But the anxiety to sustain *κέντηστος*, as the true rendering of one or other of the two words, **קְטַב** or **דְבָר**, has arisen, I believe, from an opinion which has long prevailed in the Christian Church, that the animated exultation of the Apostle St. Paul over Death and Hell, at the latter end of the 15th chapter of the First to the Corinthians, is a citation of this passage of Hosea; and this opinion is, for the most part, connected with a persuasion, that the Apostle citing must represent the Prophet's words with the greatest exactness. But we are not to assume, that the Apostle cites a particular passage; and then to conclude, that the Apostle's supposed citation gives the only true sense of the Hebrew words, which it is our bounden duty, by all contrivances and exploits of criticism, to bring out of them. We should first enquire, whether he cites or no; and if it should appear that he cites, it might still be reasonable to enquire, whether the general meaning of the Prophecy might not be sufficient for his purpose; or with what degree of accuracy it was necessary to his argument, that he should represent the Prophet's words.

Now,

Now, upon the most mature consideration of the matter, I am perswaded that the Apostle's triumphant exclamation, “O Death, where is thy sting? O Hell, where is thy victory?” is an allusion, indeed, to this text of Hosea; an indirect allusion, but no citation of it. The prophecy which the Apostle cites, as one which would receive its completion in the general resurrection at the last day, as a saying “that is written,” which shall then be brought to pass; this prophecy is written in *Is. xxv. 8.* and no where else. And this prophecy, which he cites, he cites with precision. And it may be usefull to observe, that he cites it not according to the version of the LXX. He translates the Hebrew text verbatim, in contradiction to the version of the LXX. For the version of the LXX, in this place, is so wretchedly and abominably erroneous, that the sense it gives is exactly the reverse of the sense of the Hebrew text.

The Apostle having cited this prophecy of “the swallowing up of Death “in victory,” and, looking forward to the great event, which he mentions as the yet future completion of it, breaks out in those words of triumph, which allude to this text of Hosea. Death and Hell are personified and apostrophized, both by the Prophet and by the Apostle. The purport of the apostrophe, both with the Prophet and with the Apostle, is to set forth God’s dominion over Death and Hell, and his mercifull purpose of destroying both the one and the other. This is categorically asserted by the Prophet; it is indirectly asserted, by the Apostle, in the shape of an interrogation. But in the Prophet we have no mention of the sting, with which Death is armed in the Apostle’s imagery; none of victory, by the name of victory. On the other hand, in the Apostle, we have no mention of the pestilence, and the burning plague, to be inflicted, according to the Prophet, upon Death and Hell by God the Saviour.

It may seem, that the resemblance between the words of the Apostle and the text of the Prophet, upon this comparison, turns out to be so very general, as to leave room to doubt, whether so much as an allusion was intended. But I am perswaded, that an allusion was intended: and my perswasion rests principally upon these two reasons.

1. It is hardly to be conceived, that when the Apostle’s discourse led him to refer to prophecies of the final abolition of Death and Hell, this passage of the Prophet Hosea should not come to his mind; which, for the boldness of its imagery, is far more striking than the passage of *Isaiah* which he cites; which

for that very reason perhaps he cites in preference, as being more explicit and perspicuous, because less figured and adorned.

2. Notwithstanding that a general resemblance only is to be found between the Apostle's words and the Hebrew text, these words of the Apostle are an exact literal rendering in Greek of the Syriac version of that Hebrew text: except that the words “*sting*” and “*victory*,” in the Apostle have changed places.

It would be much in the taste of modern criticism, to lay hold of this circumstance as an argument for the antiquity of the Syriac version of the Old Testament. To hold up that version, as sanctioned in this passage, by the Apostle's citation, as a true rendering of the original; and then to go to work with the Hebrew text, and, covering our own bold sacrilege under an arraignment of the carelessness of scribes in general, and the bad faith of some (a heavy charge, even against our adversaries the Jews, to which the candid will listen with great caution), to alter the text, till it should become a mere translation of the Syriac, and give it out, in that altered state, as the text of the Holy Prophet restored!

But, on the contrary, readily subscribing to the high antiquity, and general excellence of the Syriac version, I scruple not to maintain, that in this passage it is inaccurate. I deny, that the Apostle's citation of it is any argument that he entertained a different opinion of it, or gives it the least sanction as an accurate translation of the Hebrew words. For the state of the case is plainly this; that the general meaning of the prophetic text was all that was requisite for the purpose of the Apostle's discourse. Nothing depended upon a close interpretation of the words. And the general meaning the Syriac version gives; the full meaning, with less force, in my judgement, than the original; still with force, and with the greatest perspicuity. And there is this particular circumstance in it, which might incline the Apostle to prefer it, upon this occasion, to a more precise translation of the original, which he certainly could have given. The form of the sentence in the Syriac is such as would readily admit of being interwoven into the Apostle's discourse, so as to make a part of it; not in the stiff form of a quotation, but as the Apostle's own expression of his own sentiments. With his mind full of the general resurrection, and of the prophecies relating to it, he gives utterance to his own feelings of joy and exultation in words taken from the Syriac version of Hosca's text; which are

better

better suited to that purpose, the purpose of being used as the Apostle's words, than Hosea's own words. In this manner of adopting the words of the Syriac version, certainly no approbation is involved of its verbal accuracy.

St. Jerome, who knew nothing, I believe, of the Syriac version, seems to have entertained a notion of the Apostle's allusion to the Prophet not very different from mine. In his Comment upon Hosea, having affirmed that the Apostle St. Paul understands this text of the resurrection of our Lord (he should rather have said, of the general resurrection, as the effect and consequence of our Lord's) he adds, “ Itaque quod ille [scil. Apostolus] in resurrectionem interpretatus est Domini, nos aliter interpretari nec possumus nec audemus.” Where observe, he is not speaking of the verbal accuracy of the translation used by the Apostle, as if that were not to be meddled with; but of the application of the Prophecy in its general meaning. The Apostle having made the application, the Holy Father says he submits implicitly; and would not venture to apply it otherwise, if he could. But of the verbal accuracy of the translation, in this place, he says nothing. In another place, in his comment upon the 14th chapter of Isaiah, he discovers his opinion upon that point. For he speaks of the Apostle's triumphant exclamation, as the Apostle's expression of his own sentiments, arising in his mind upon his meditating within himself upon Hosea's words. “ Unde & Apostolus Paulus, interfet. morte, ad quam per Osee sermo propheticus loquebatur, ‘ Ero mors tua, o mors, ero mors tuus inferne,’ loquitur ad eam, ‘ Ubi est mors contentio tua, ubi est mors stimulus tuus?’ ” It is not to my present purpose, to remark on the variations from the Greek text of the New Testament, as it now stands, with which St. Jerome cites the Apostle's words. But what I would observe, is this. That he evidently represents the Divine Speaker in Hosea, as addressing Death in certain words; and the Apostle, as addressing Death in other words. He represents the Divine Speaker in Hosea, as addressing Death yet alive; the Apostle, as speaking to Death lying dead before him. He considers the Apostle therefore as uttering sentiments of his own, in words of his own. He was not aware, I believe, that the Apostle borrowed his words from the Syriac version of the words in Hosea. But this makes no difference. He must have considered the Apostle's exclamation as an allusion only to the Prophet, not as a citation of any thing more than the general sense; much less as an accurate translation.

translation, which it were impious not to receive, as giving the sense of the Hebrew words with more certainty than the Hebrew words themselves.

I cannot clore this long note, without briefly animadverting on the plausible, but fallacious, doctrine of sanction, supposed to be given to the antient versions of the Old Testament, by the citation of particular passages from them in the New.

And, with respect to the Septuagint in particular, in behalf of which this sanction is most frequently pleaded; I observe, that what is generally assumed upon this subject is not true. Namely, that the citations of texts of the Old Testament in the New are always from this version. This assumption, I say, is not invariably true. The instances, in which it fails, are many. I have mentioned one very remarkable instance; and I could produce many more.

I say, secondly, that upon the same principle, that a citation of the Old Testament by the inspired writers of the New, according to that particular version, is to be taken as a sanction of the version; the citation of a text, not in the words of the LXX, more particularly in words that give a sense directly opposite to their sense, is a reprobation of the version. And since the inspired writers of the New Testament cite some passages according to the LXX, and some not according to the LXX; it follows, that they sanction the version in some passages, and reprobate the version in others. And neither the sanction nor the reprobation must be extended farther, than to the particular texts cited. In the texts not cited, we have no judgement of the inspired writers of the New Testament upon the merits of the version. And as these uncited texts make certainly the far greater part of the whole book; I shall contradict no Apostle, or inspired writer, if I assert, as I do, of the Septuagint generally, that antient, respectable, usefull, and valuable, as it is, and in many parts excellent; it is not, upon the whole, to be put in competition, for verbal accuracy, either with our own public translation, or with the Vulgate.

But, thirdly, I go further. I contend, that even with respect to the particular passages cited in the New Testament, according to the version of LXX; we are not always to conclude, that the citation implies the citer's approbation of the verbal accuracy of the translation, even in the instance of the passage cited. This will be indeed a just conclusion, if a faithfull representation of the phrascology of the original be requisite for the purpose of the citer. But if the general meaning of the passage cited is sufficient, which, for the most part, is the case; no sanction of any thing more than the general meaning,

which

which is often very adequately given in a very loose, and with respect to words, even an erroneous translation, can be inferred from the citation. For it certainly became the wisdom of the Apostles to cite the Old Testament, according to the versions most in use and credit in their time, however defective in verbal accuracy; provided they found in them the general meaning: except indeed in those few cases, in which their argument turned upon the wording of the original. It was no part of the duty of the holy Apostles and inspired preachers, to edit a correct Greek translation of the Old Testament, or to give critical notes upon the extant versions.

(X) I place the soph-pasuk at לֹא שָׁמַד, and make the three words that follow the beginning of the 15th verse.

“No repentance is discernible to my eyes!” literally, “Repentance is ‘hidden from mine eyes.’” I cannot be persuaded, that this can possibly signify, that God’s mind would never change, with respect to his declared purpose of abolishing Death and Hell, notwithstanding the immutability of that declared purpose. It is pertinently remarked by Houbigant, that the internal purposes or affections of the mind of any person cannot be represented as an object of vision, to that person. It cannot be said of them, that, to the person himself, they are either visible or invisible. The repentance, or change of mind, said to be seen, or not seen, must be the external signs of repentance seen, or not seen, by one person in another. I cannot, however, agree with the learned Houbigant, that the sense of the passage is a dreadfull denunciation on the part of God, that he will shut his eyes against repentance, and pay no regard to it. The sentiment is horrible. No such declaration is to be found in the whole Bible; but repeated declarations of the contrary purport. It is astonishing, that such a notion could drop from the pen, or indeed enter the mind of a writer of Houbigant’s piety, and so conversant in the Holy Scriptures. The words are evidently words of complaint on the part of God, as I have explained in note (9), that no signs of repentance were to be found, by his all-searching eye, in Ephraim. This sense arises so clearly from the Hebrew words, when the sentences are properly divided, and is so much more to the purpose than any other, that nothing but an erroneous division could have kept it out of sight.

(Y)

(Y) ——— savage beasts.” אֲחֵי מֶלֶךְ. So I would point the word (not אֲחֵי מֶלֶךְ); and take it as in If. xiii. 21.

(Z) ——— East-wind — blast.” רוח קָדִים or, רוח קָדִים, is the East-wind. But קָדִים by itself, without רוח, is often put for the East-wind; almost as often, as in apposition with רוח. And in Isaiah xxvii. 8. the two nouns are put separately, as they are here, as different appellatives of the same thing, בְּרוּחַ קָשָׁה נֵוֶם קָדִים.

(AΔ) ——— shall He.” הָא. An emphatic pleonasm of the pronoun at the end of the sentence. See chap. v. 14. and xi. 2.

CHAP. XIV.

(A) TAKE with you words.” The phrase seems very similar to that “he took up his parable^a,” i. e. he assumed his prophetic style. And it seems, in both cases, to refer to a set form of words. For it is remarkable, that the exordium of every one of Balaam’s effusions is a form; describing, in a highly-adorned style of amplification, the privileges of the prophetical office; or delivering certain solemn γνῶμαι, which might suit almost any occasion of prophecy: and the resorting to these set forms is “taking words” or “taking up the parable;” a phrase, however, that might be used, to express only the assumption of the peculiar style of the prophetic song. The formal próem of the last of Balaam’s effusions is by far the most striking.

^a Num. xxiii. 7, 13. xxiv. 3, 15.

“ Then

“ Then he took up his parable, and said^a,

“ Balaam, the son of Beor, hath said,
 “ Even he hath said the man of the secret eye^b.
 “ He hath said who heareth the speech of God,
 “ And knoweth the knowledge of the Most High.
 “ He feeth the scene of the Almighty,
 “ He is laid at his length^c, and his eyes are set open.”

The exordium of the preceding song (the third) is the same, with very little difference; an amplification of the prophetic gift.

That of the second is different; but still it is much of a set form, composed of general γνῶμαι.

“ Then he took up his parable, and said^d,

“ Rise up, Balak, and hear,
 “ Give ear to me, O Son of Zippor.
 “ God is no man, that he should lie,
 “ Nor son of man, that he should repent him.
 “ Hath he said, and shall he not perform?
 “ Or spoken, and shall he not establish?”

^a Num. xxiv. 15, &c.

^b הנְּבֵר שְׁתָם הַעַז. I take שְׁתָם, which, occurs only in this place, to be an unusual orthography of the word סְתָם, abditus, intus absconditus. The Holy Psalmist says (li. 8.), “ Behold, thou delightest in truth in the inward parts, and shalt teach me wisdom בְּשְׁתָמָם.” οὐ τῷ ἐστιν ἀνθεύποι, as Mr. Parkhurst well explains it. So the prophetic gift, foreseeing things to come, is here described, under the image of a secret internal eye. And in the same language, Æschylus makes Orestes, in the Choephoræ, describe the oracular prescience of Apollo.

‘Ορεᾶντα λαμπρὸν ἐν σκότῳ γαμᾶν γ’ ὁφρύν. Line 283.

^c ——— laid at his length.” This intimates, that when the ecstasy seized him, he usually fell down in a trance; and the emblematical scene was forced upon him, while he lay in that state.

^d Num. xxiii. 18, &c.

The exordium of the first song is far more simple, being nothing more than a distich; but still it has the air of set form, and, *mutatis mutandis*, might serve any such occasion.

“ Then he took up his parable, and said ^a,

“ Me hath Balak brought from Aram,

“ The King of Moab from the mountains of the East.”

That set forms were in use in the earliest ages, upon all solemn occasions, is evident, with respect to the Jews, from Holy Writ; and with respect to the Heathen, from the poets. Miriam’s Song of Thanksgiving is evidently a studied composition, set to music, and performed in parts, according to a preconcerted plan, by her and the chorus of attending virgins. In the Book of Numbers, a form of words is prescribed, in which the priests were to bless the people ^b. In the Book of Deuteronomy ^c, a form of prayer and confession is prescribed, to be used by every Israelite that presented his first fruits, and at the end of his tithing. Part of the 105th Psalm, with the 96th, is a form of thanksgiving, which “ David delivered into the hands of Asaph and his brethren” upon the occasion of bringing up the ark from the house of Obed-Edom, and placing it in the tent that David had pitched for it. Solomon’s prayer, at the dedication of the Temple ^d, is most evidently studied composition, Jehoshaphat’s ^e, when he proclaimed a fast, under the terror of the powerfull confederacy of the Moabites and Ammonites. And the Priests and Levites, which upon this occasion attended the army, praised Jehovah in a set form of words. The service of the temple, restored by Hezekiah ^f, was certainly according to the settled form of an antient ritual; in particular, the Levites were commanded by the King “ to sing praise unto Jehovah with the words of David the King, and “ of Asaph the Seer.” Upon the return from the captivity, when the foundations of the Temple were laid, the Priests and Levites attended in their sacred vestments, the Priests with their trumpets, and the Levites with their cymbals, to “ praise Jehovah after the ordinance of David King of Israel.” And their

^a Num. xxiii. 7.

^b Num. vi. 23—26.

^c Chap. xxvi. 5—10. and 13—15.

^d 1 Kings, viii. 22—53. 2 Chron. vi. 12—42.

^e 2 Chron. xx.

^f 2 Chron. xxix. 30.

praise

praise was in David's set form of words, " Give thanks unto Jehovah, be-
" cause he is good; because his mercy toward Israel endureth for ever^a ." Such proof we find of the use of forms of worship among the Jews from the earliest times.

Among the Heathen, the thing is unquestionably proved by the Orphic Hymns, as they are very improperly called. They are, indeed, set forms of invocation of the several Deities, which were the object of worship to the Greeks. In Homer it is very remarkable, that in the two prayers of Chryses, the one imploring the vengeance of Apollo on the Greeks, after Agamemnon's refusal of the proffered ransom of his daughter; the other, solliciting the God's blessing on the Greeks, when his daughter was restored; the prefatory invocation is nearly in the same words in both, and much in the stile of the Orphic services, addressing the God by his various titles.

Κλῦθι μεν, Αργυρότεξ, οἵς Χρύσην αὔμφιξέ Βηγκας,
Κίλλαν τε ζαθένην, Τεριδοί τε ἦφι αἰνέσσεις.
Σμινθεῦ.

II. A. 36. and 451.

But, what is more remarkable, in the body of the prayers the expressions seem to be as much the same, as the difference in the matter of the petitions would allow.

(B) So St. Jerome understood this petition. " 'Omnem aufer iniquitatem & accipe bonum.' Nihil languoris in nobis & ruinæ pristinæ derelinquas, ne rursum mali feminis pullulent rediviva plantaria. ' Et accipe, inquit, bonum. Nisi enim tuleris mala nostra, bonum tibi quod offeramus, habere non possumus.' " Diodati's exposition is to the same purpose.

(C) ——— bullocks our own lips." No figure is more familiar in the Hebrew language, than that sort of metonymy, which puts the cause, or instrument, for the effect; lips for words uttered by the lips. For the lips are a principal instrument in the articulation of words. It is very remarkable, however, that the word **נֶשֶׁב**, " lip," when put for words uttered with the lip, seems peculiarly applied to set forms of words in public worship. The Prophet Isaiah, speaking of the introduction of the true worship into Egypt, says, " In that day shall five cities in the land of Egypt speak the lip of Canaan^b ;"

^a Ezra iii. 10. 11.

^b Is. xix. 18.

that is, as appears by the context, adopt the forms of public worship used by God's true church in Palestine. The Prophet Zephaniah, speaking of the final conversion of all the nations of the earth, says, "In that day I will turn " to the peoples a *pure lip* (שְׁפָה בָּרוּתָה), that they may all of them call upon " the name of Jehovah^a;" where a pure lip evidently signifies a form of worship purged of all corruptions. It is used very remarkably in this sense in Psalm xii. 5. " — Our lips are our own." The subject of that Psalm is Free-thinkers; their learning, audacity, and final excision. The Psalmist, drawing these gentlemen to the life, makes them say, what they are heard to say daily — " our lips are our own;" i. e. we have a right to choose our own way of worship; to worship what we please, as we please, or not to worship at all, if that should best please us. In Psalm lxxxii. 6. it is said of the land of Egypt, as we read in our English Bible, " I heard a language that I under- " stood not." But, Jehovah being the speaker, this, as has been observed by the learned Julius Bate, must be an erroneous translation. Indeed, the literal rendering is, " A lip which I acknowledged not (i. e. a worship which I disap- " proved) I heard." The sense seems to be, that even Israel, in his state of servitude in Egypt, was compelled to take part in corrupt and idolatrous rites. Upon a review of all these passages, had I rendered the words of Hosea, " — bullocks, our devout confessions," I think I should have been justified by the peculiar use of the word שְׁפָה in so many places. But I choose to adhere to the literal rendering of the Hebrew words; as the metonymy, though in this instance somewhat harsh in our language, is abundantly perspicuous. With what view, the worship of the Father in Spirit and in Truth is represented, under the image of bullocks sacrificed, I have shewn in note (e).

A slight inaccuracy in our public translation, which, departing not a tittle from the sense, but in a minute circumstance from the construction of the Hebrew, renders, " — calves of our lips," as if " lips" were the latter of two noun substantives, which ought to be expressed in the genitive case in our language, and ought in the Hebrew to induce the construct form upon the preceding substantive; this slight inaccuracy has occasioned this remark of Archbishop Newcome, to justify an alteration of the text, which he adopts. " The phrase as it stands is NOT HEBREW; because פָּרִים, the calves, should be *in statu constructo*.

^a Zeph. iii. 9.

" Jos.

“ Jof. Mede, p. 282. and Le Clerc, on Hebr. xiii. 15. read, משפטינו — fruit “ from our lips ; & Ar. read, *the fruit of our lips* ; and Syr. *the fruit of your lips* ; “ as if they omitted ה. See Hebr. xiii. 15.”

Had the learned Primate forgotten all the instances, that are produced by the Jewish grammarians, of an enallage of the *status absolutus* and *status constructus*, and the opposite ? And is not this an answer to the formidable objection of the NOT HEBREW of the phrase ? Perhaps indeed, when the instances of supposed enallage come to be examined, it will be found that many of them are to be solved by an ellipsis (which was Kinichi’s opinion of them all), and that others are reducible to a case of simple apposition, in which the *status constructus* would be improper. Not to enumerate specific instances, this will be the case, where the two substantives are only different appellatives of the same thing, in different respects. Thus זבחים שלמים² are two appellatives of the same thing ; the one a generic, and the other a specific name, in perfect apposition. And this I take to be the very case here : שפטינו and פרים are two appellatives of the same thing, in different respects : of prayers as articulated ; and of prayers under the image of animals sacrificed, because offered to God. And these two appellatives of the same thing are properly put in perfect apposition. This I take to be the truth of the construction in this place.

But if an enallage of the two states of nouns, the absolute and the construct, is ever to be admitted (and perhaps it would be difficult to reduce every instance of it to ellipsis, or to apposition), I ask, in what instance it may with more reason be admitted, than in פרים, the plural of בָר, a bullock ? which, if according to the rule of construction it were to drop the final ס, would not be distinguishable by the letters from the noun substantive singular פרי, *fruit*. And in fact, upon a diligent investigation, I cannot find פרים, the plural of בָר, in the construct state in the whole Bible, except in one instance ; in which it is constructed with a pronoun suffixed, and the context renders it impossible to mistake the meaning of the word. This instance occurs in Jeremiah L. 27. The subject is the destruction of Babylon, Jehovah himself leading up the armies to the attack ; “ for this was the work of Jehovah of hosts in the land of “ the Chaldaeans. Come against her from the utmost border — open her fattering

² Exod. xxiv. 5.

“ stalls —

“*falls*—**חרבו כל פריה**. Slay all her bullocks—let them go down to the “slaughter.”

No emendation therefore is necessary in this text of Hosea, to wipe off the imputation of “Not Hebrew.” And if no emendation is necessary, Le Clerc’s proposed alteration hardly deserves further notice. I must just however remark, that although the prefix **בְּ** is often used as the preposition of the efficient or the procreant, no instance is to be found of the word **בַּרְיָה** in this construction. In justice to the memory of Joseph Mede, it must be remarked, that it is by some inadvertency, that his authority is cited in support of Le Clerc’s reading. Joseph Mede says but little about this text; but what he says is to the contrary effect. In Book I. Discourse XLIX. upon the Nature of Offerings, &c. Mede says, that “the Euðical, or Eucharistical offering must “consist of three degrees, or parts; the offering of the heart, of the mouth, “of the hand. The offering of the heart is a “*Sursum Corda*,” the lifting “up of our hearts to God, either to praise him, or to pray unto him. The “offering of our mouth is to express the same with our tongues, and is called “THE CALVES OF OUR LIPS.” And he refers in the margin to this text of Hosea. But how is the mouth-offering called in this text of Hosea “the “calves of our lips,” if Le Clerc’s alteration be admitted? It is true, that Mede, in his margin, refers to Heb. xiii. 15. together with Hosea xiv. 2. as a parallel place; but without the least intimation that he thought “calves or “bullocks of the lips” was not the Prophet’s genuine expression. To Le Clerc therefore alone be ascribed, for to him alone belongs, the entire unrivalled glory of this unlearned paltry criticism.

But by the reference to Heb. xiii. 15. at the end of the learned Primate’s note, I perceive that he thought a greater authority, than that of Joseph Mede, was to be produced, in support of the alteration he would adopt. And in that opinion he certainly was not alone. Without repeating what I have written at great length in the latter part of note (V) of the former chapter, concerning the inference to be drawn from citations in the New Testament of passages of the Old, according to the versions, when the versions differ in words, though not in sense, from the Hebrew text; the whole of which would apply in this case, were it certain that the Apostle cites the Prophet Hosea in that text of his Epistle to the Hebrews: but without repeating this, I say that it is not certain, from any thing in the Apostle’s own words, that he either cites, or so much as alludes to Hosea. Without the mention of any

any writer of the Old Testament, he explains a phrase, which probably was current as a Scripture phrase, in his time. And he gives the plain sense of it, without saying where it was found in the Bible, and without any discussion of it as the proper rendering of any Hebrew text. That he alludes to it as a phrase of the Old Testament, I believe. But that this text of Hosea was the particular passage in his mind, would never have been surmised, had not the LXX unfortunately given *καρπὸν χειλέων ἥμαν*, instead of any Greek words rendering “calves or bullocks of lips;” while the near resemblance of the words פָּרִים and פָּרִי, which was the occasion of their mistake, favoured the hasty conjecture of a mistake of the Hebrew scribe; which could not have been less, than a double mistake; first, פָּרִי, in the sense of fruit, must have been mistaken for פָּרִים, the plural of פָּר, in *statu constructo*; and then, by a second blunder, פָּרִים, in the absolute state, must have been written instead of פָּרִי, so misunderstood. St. Jerome, without the least hesitation, taxes the LXX with the error of confounding the two words; so little did he conceive any allusion in St. Paul to this passage of Hosea, which might sanction their mis-translation. In truth, these interpreters were in the habit of confounding these two words. They have confounded them in the passage already cited from Jeremiah², where the mistake might seem impossible. But, for “slay all her bullocks,” they give ἀναξηράνατε ἀυτῆς τὰν πάντας καρπάς. Some, indeed, have attempted to defend their version in this place, without impeaching the integrity of the Hebrew text. Observing that they often use the derivatives *καρπωμα*, *καρπωσις*, and ὁλοκάρπωμα, ὁλοκάρπωσις, for burnt-offering, and whole burnt-offering, these critics infer, that the primitive *καρπός*, in the phraseology of the LXX, might signify a bullock, an animal for burnt-offering. This defence however is an admission, that the Hebrew text is correct as it stands. For the principle of the defence is this; that *καρπός* may perchance be Greek for a bullock!

All this anxiety to sustain the version of the LXX in this place, the solicitude of some to defend the Hebrew text against the suspicion of corruption brought upon it by that version, and the readiness in others to give it up as incapable of defence, arises from a supposition common to them all, that the version of the LXX has received the sanction of St. Paul. And the supposition, that their version has received that sanction, rests on an assumption, that

² 1. 27.

this text of Hosea is the passage which St. Paul cites, or to which he alludes in Heb. xiii. 15. But that the Apostle cites it not, is most evident upon the slightest inspection of his text; for he certainly cites no passage. But what reason have we to believe, that he alludes to this text of Hosea, rather than to some other text of some other writer of the Old Testament? The Apostle, as I have already said, explains the phrase, "fruit of the lips," as a Scripture phrase; without saying in what part of the Old Testament he found it. And will it not be a phrase of the Old Testament, although it should not be found in this text of Hosea, according to the true reading and a true translation? Is not the phrase to be found, not introduced by any of the versions, but is it not to be found, in the very sense in which the Apostle takes it, in the Hebrew text of the Prophet Isaiah?

In the 19th verse of the 57th chapter of that Prophet, Jehovah says, "I "create the fruit of the lips;" where the context shews, that "the fruit of "the lips" can be nothing else than the sacrifice of praise, as it is explained by Grotius, by Lowth the father, and by Bishop Lowth. And this sense is so evident, so much more obvious than others to which the words have been wrested, that not only those able critics, but that dullest of all commentators, Samuel White, could perceive, that this is probably the passage to which the Apostle alludes. And this deserves a deeper consideration.

The entire passage of the Prophet Isaiah stands thus:

בָּרוּא נִבְּ שְׁפָטִים שָׁלוֹם לְרָחוֹק וּלְקָרוֹב אָמַר יְהוָה וּרְפָאָתָיו

The true construction of the sentence is pointed out in the Vulgate, as the Latin is pointed in the London Polyglott. "Creavi fructum labiorum "pacem, pacem &c." This interpreter took the substantives נִבְּ and שָׁלוֹם as accusatives, in apposition, after בָּרוּא; the one rendering the cause, either material, or efficient, or final, of the thing, denoted by the other as formed. It must be confessed, that this construction of the verb בָּרָא with two accusatives is rare; but it is by no means unexampled. We find it, Psalm lxxxix: 48. "על מה שא בראת כל בני אדם. "Wherefore hast thou made all men " (not in vain but) vanity." Again, Is. xlvi. 18. "לא תהו בראה. "He created "it (i. e. the earth, not *not in vain*, but) not emptiness [for] he formed it "to be inhabited." Again, Is. lxv. 18. בָּרוּא את יְרוּשָׁלָם גִּלְּה וְעַמָּה מִשְׁׁוֹשָׁן. "I create Jerusalem a rejoicing, and her people a joy." And this I take to be

the true grammatical construction of this 19th verse of the 57th chapter; and, in this, if I mistake not, I have the concurrence of the learned Forerius.

If this be admitted, the word **שָׁלָשׁ**, “peace,” may be taken as the material cause, and **שְׁפָטִים**, “fruit of the lips,” as the thing made. And the sense will be, “I make (or am making) peace the subject or matter of praise and “thanksgiving.” And this is the exposition of Forerius, and of Grotius. Forerius, indeed, applies the prophecy primarily to the peace and quiet, which the Jews enjoyed under the Persian Kings; but he acknowledges, that ultimately it relates to the universal peace made by Jesus Christ, of which he considers the other as typical. But if this be the true grammatical exposition and rendering of the words; the “peace” must be the “peace” made by our Lord Jesus Christ, exclusively of any other; for it is a peace “to him that is “far off, as well as to him that is near; to Gentile, as well as Jew.” Bishop Lowth brings the passage to the same sense, though by a different grammatical construction.

The sense is certainly good, and very pertinent to the subject of the discourse. But yet I doubt, whether it be the exact sense. From the root **שָׁלָשׁ**, “to be at peace,” come, as the Masoretes will have it, two different noun substantives, **שָׁלָשׁ** and **שְׁלָשׁ**; the first signifying “peace;” the second, “a “peace-offering.” The first is often written with the Cholem point, without the sustaining **ו**. And, so written, it is not distinguishable, otherwise than by the points, from the second; which the Masoretes have been pleased to point with a double Segol. But they, who, with me, have abjured the worship of the Masoretic points, will say, that these two are in truth one and the same word, carrying two different senses, and written sometimes at full length, but much oftener defectively, without the **ו**.

Before I proceed, it will be much to my purpose to premise, that among all the offerings of the Jews, the peace-offering was that, which was particularly typical of the worship of the Christian Church. It was offered either as a thanksgiving for some particular mercy; or upon the completion of a vow; or as an act of general voluntary worship, not required by any law, or called for by any particular obligation; in which last case it was called the “free-will “offering.” Now, the sin-offering, the trespass-offering, and the perpetual burnt offering, were all expiatory of particular or general guilt: and were all typical of the sacrifice upon the cross. But in the peace offering, the wor-

shipper was taken as already at peace with God, and entitled to partake of the feast upon the sacrifice he offered. These offerings therefore were peculiarly typical of the worship in the Christian church.

Now since בָּשָׂר and בָּשָׂר are the same word differently written; why may not בָּשָׂר, in this passage of Isaiah, render “a peace-offering?” It is true, the noun in this sense is for the most part in the plural. But it is used in this sense in the singular¹. And if it be taken in this sense here, then נִיבַּתְבִּית, “fruit of the lips,” will be the material, and בָּשָׂר, “the peace-offering,” the thing made of that material. “I create the fruit of the lips, peace offering (i. e. I make it to be, or, I make of it; the peace offering); peace-offering for him that is far off, and for him that is near, saith Jehovah.” Thus the passage will be a prediction of the institution of that worship, of which the peace-offering was particularly a type, as the universal worship for all that are brought to Christ, whether of the Jews, or of the Gentiles.

The participle בָּנָה, in this view of the passage, is used here with particular propriety and emphasis. The institution of a new mode of worship is called a Creation, as a thing to which no authority, but that of God himself, is competent.

If the learned reader will consider this text critically, and consider also critically the text of St. Paul, in Heb. xiii.; if he observes, how St. Paul connects “fruit of the lips” (καρπὸν χειλέων) with “sacrifice of praise” (θυσίᾳ ανέστεις, בְּשָׂר), he will perhaps be inclined to think favourably of the interpretation I offer of Isaiah’s text; at any rate he will conclude, that the passage of Isaiah is that to which the Prophet alludes.

It will hardly be made an objection, that this phrase of “the fruit of the lips,” though it be found in the Hebrew of Isaiah, is not in the Greek of the LXX in that passage. The Greek of the LXX in that passage is indeed so unlike either the Hebrew text, or any of the other versions (except its echo the Arabic), that it may well be suspected of great corruption. And what is not found in it now, might be in it in the time of the Apostle; when its text was in a better state. But, suppose this was not the case. Was the Apostle under any obligation, not to cite the Old Testament but according to the Septuagint, even when the Septuagint was wrong? Did he not understand the Hebrew language, as well, or better, than any or all of these 72 interpreters?

¹ See Amos v. 22.

Was he not at liberty to translate for himself, when he thought proper; as he, and the other writers of the New Testament, have done, in many instances, when the LXX had grossly mistaken (as they often have) the sense of the Hebrew? But with those idolizers of the Septuagint, who would bind the inspired Apostles (or even others who are not inspired) to its authority, and tamper with the Hebrew text without the least necessity, rather than confess the authors of that version to have been in error, I hold no argument.

(D) ——— from me." I follow the reading of the Oriental Synagogue, כְּמַנִּי, instead of כְּמַנּוּ, which makes a more regular construction, without altering the sense.

(E) His suckers shall spread farther and farther." יְלָכֹו. " ——— shall go on." I think the image is the increasing vegetation of the forest, by the branches of the parent tree reaching quite down to the ground, where, resting upon the moist soil, each strikes a new root, or more than one, and each root sends up a new tree.

(F) They shall return." For יִשְׁבּוּ, the latter Prophets of Soncinum (1486), thirty-one MSS. of Dr. Kennicott's, and three more originally, give יִשְׁבּוּ. And the latter Prophets of Soncinum, the latter Prophets of Pesaro (1516), and seven MSS. of Dr. Kennicott's, give the next word יִשְׁבּוּ.

(G) ——— they shall abound in corn," literally — "they shall vivify " corn," they shall grow abundant thriving crops^a.

(H) ——— and be famous as the wine of Lebanon," literally, " זָהָרָו, his com- " memoration, i. e. his praise like the wine of Lebanon." Thus Houbigant: " me- " moria ejus ut vini, &c. five sermone celebrabitur ut vina generosa celebrantur & " laudantur; verbum pro verbo, commemoratio ejus ut vini." And to the same effect Coverdale, the Bishop's Bible, and Livelye. Great difficulty has been made about the singular number of the suffixed pronoun; which it has been thought, for that reason, could not relate to the subject of the plural verbs, which pre-

^a See Pocock, vol. II. p. 705.

cede, and to the noun, understood, in apposition with the plural participle. This difficulty to me appears nothing. If **ישראל** be the antecedent of the **ר** suffixed to **יבר**, Israel is a collective; and, as such, may be joined with verbs in the singular or plural indifferently, and may be rehearsed either by singular or plural pronouns. In the 4th verse, Israel is rehearsed by plural pronouns. In the 5th, the same word, or a pronoun understood rehearsing it, is constructed with verbs in the singular, and rehearsed by a singular suffix. In this 7th verse, the pronoun understood, rehearsing Israel as the subject of the verbs **שׁובו** and **יפרוח**, and in apposition with the participle **יושבי** must be plural: whereas the pronoun suffixed to **יבר**, rehearsing Israel, according to the construction and sense which I adopt, is singular. But in this there is no difficulty at all. For nothing is more frequent, than for collective nouns, in form singular, to be rehearsed by plural and singular pronouns indifferently, and constructed with singular and plural verbs, not only in the same sentence, but in the same clause ^a.

(I) Ephraim! &c." The very learned Drusius thinks there is something wanting after Ephraim. He therefore supplies, " *dicet*," understanding what follows as the speech of Ephraim. The conjecture seems to have been suggested to his mind by the state of the accents; which are not what they ought to be, according to the Masoretic rules, if nothing be wanting after the word Ephraim. The Syriac version, and the Chaldee paraphrase, certainly insert " shall say." Nevertheless, I am persuaded the insertion is improper. For the state of the accents, let the Masoretes look to that. The whole verse is an *ēnōnō*, in the person of Jehovah, over fallen idols, and a gratulation of the return even of Ephraim (whose case seemed the most desperate) to his God: according to the explanation which I have given in note ^(m).

(K) ——— and I will make him flourish." **נִרְאֵא**. I take the word as the first person fut. sing. Kal of the verb **רָא**, " to prosper," or " to make prosperous," as it is taken in all the antient versions. Houbigant observes, that this verb in Arabic is specifically applied to the prosperous growth of trees. The Vulgate seems to have taken the verb in this sense here — " & dirigam " eum ego ut abietem virentem" — dirigam — I will lead him up strait and tall.

^a See Appendix, N^o II.

— from

——— from me thy fruit is supplied." "This," says Diodati, "may be understood of the good works of the faithfull, produced by the sole power of grace, and of the Spirit of God within them."

(L) —— wife — intelligent — shall comprehend." The three words חָכֶם, בָּן, and יָדָם, are so nearly allied in signification, that they are often used promiscuously one for the other, especially the two first. Each, however, has its own strict sense different from the strict sense of either of the other. And it is often of importance to attend to the difference, as it is in the present instance: for the first and second clauses of this verse are by no means tautologies. "Who is wise?" and "who is intelligent?" are different interrogations. And the apodosis to this, and that, is different.

These three roots, חָכֶם, בָּן, and יָדָם, differ as δύαρις, πατεῖν, and ἐνθάδεσαι. The root חָכֶם speaks of wisdom, merely as a power in the mind. To be endowed with the power, or powers, of wisdom. בָּן speaks of that power in action, actually exercised in observing and noticing the differences of things, and passing a judgement of distinction between them. This wisdom energizing, we call, in our language, understanding, or intelligence; in the popular, not in the metaphysical sense of the word intelligence. Lastly, יָדָם, although it speaks of knowledge of any sort, and by whatever means acquired; and has many senses, which belong not to the English word "to know," for it renders the Latin *noscere* and all its compounds; yet strictly it is "to know that knowledge," which is acquired by בָּן; and thus it properly speaks of the ἐνθάδεσαι of wisdom energising.

"I want a man endowed with the powers of wisdom," says the Prophet. "For he will employ those powers of his mind upon these predictions and revelations of mine. I want a man that will so employ the powers of his mind; "for he, and he only, will attain a knowledge of them."

(M) —— streight and even." I use both these words to express the full force of שָׁרֵם. For שָׁרֵם, applied to a road, expresses both that it is drawn in a streight direction, without turnings or windings, and that is smooth and level, without inequalities.

(N).

(N) ——— the justified.” For זְדִיקִם, the latter Prophets of Soncinum (1486),, the varieties of the Venice Bible (1518), forty-five MSS. of Kennicott’s, and one more originally, give זְדִיקִים. Two MSS. of Kennicott’s give זְדִיקָת. And three or four give זְדִיקִם. It seems therefore a safe conclusion, that זְדִיקִם is the true reading, which is the plural of זְדִיקָה with י prefixed.

צדק is properly a forensic word, and signifies a person found not guilty, acquitted, and justified upon a trial. Hence, in a theological sense, it is a person found innocent in the sight of God. In the Book of Psalms, and occasionally elsewhere in Scripture, it is a title of Christ, in his human nature, and should be rendered “ the Just One.” He who stands justified by the perfectness of his own obedience. The only one of the Human race who ever was Just, or justified, by his own justice. The plural זְדִיקִם, except where the matter of the discourse is relative to mere secular transactions, signifies “ the “ justified,” those that are justified by faith in the Redeemer coming, or to come, and cloathed with his righteousness.

With respect to this plural word, it has been remarked by some of the ablest critics among the Jews, that in all places where it occurs in the Pentateuch, except one, it is written without the plural י: זְדִיקָה. Now the places in the Pentateuch, in which it occurs, are six; namely, Gen. xviii. 24. 26. 28.; Exod. xxiii. 8.; Deut. iv. 8.; xvi. 19. The one place in which it appears in its perfect form, זְדִיקִם, in all the printed Bibles, and in all the MSS. but three, is Exodus xxiii. 8. In the other five passages also, the Samaritan text, and some of the best printed texts, and a great number of the very best MSS, give it full.

The text of Exodus^a, where it is, by admission, in its perfect form, זְדִיקִם, is very decisive for the proper meaning of the word. “ And thou shalt take “ no gift: for the gift blindeth the clear-sighted, and overturneth (not per- “ verteth) דברי צְדִיקִים, the cause of those who ought to be acquitted,” causam justificandorum. Thus Kimchi expounds the passage.

With respect to the singular צְדִיקָה, Hutchinson, though he considers it as a title of Christ, renders it “ the Justifier^b.” But he is mistaken. The Hebrew word for “ Justifier” should be מִצְדִּיק, from the Hiphil of the verb. But this word, מִצְדִּיק, is never used as a title of Christ. It occurs indeed but once in

^a xxiii. 8.

^b See his Works, vol. VIII. p. 97.

the whole Bible; namely, in Daniel xii. 3. where it is the nominative plural, in the construct state, and describes the preachers of the word of God, under the character of the Justifiers of many.

Mr. Hutchinson cites Jer. xxiii. 5. as confirming his interpretation of צדיק. But this text affords no example of the use of the word in his sense, “the ‘Justifier.’” The literal rendering of the 5th and 6th verses of the 23d of Jeremiah is to this effect.

5. “Behold, the days [are] coming, saith Jehovah, when I will raise up “to David a branch ^a, the Just One ^b; and King shall be King ^c, and prof- “per, and shall execute judgement and justice in the earth.”

6. “In his days Judah shall be safe, and Israel shall dwell safely. And this “is his name whereby he shall be called, JEHOVAH-OUR-RIGHTEOUSNESS.”

— King shall be King.” i. e. He who is King of right shall be King in fact. מלך, King, according to the Jew Doctors themselves, is one of the titles of Messiah.

— judgement and justice.” משפט וצדקה. When these two words are connected, as they are here, they express the whole office of a judge. “Judge-“ment,” the condemnation of the guilty; “justice,” the absolution of the innocent. This is a very just remark of Mercerus, with respect to the two words, as jointly applied to a Judge, Magistrate, or Sovereign, in the exercise of his public character. When applied jointly to describe the principles of judgement, צדק, is properly “equity;” משפט, “law” of positive institu- tion. Again, as qualities in the moral or religious character of the individual, צדקה, is “justice,” with regard to the universal natural distinctions of right and wrong; משפט, is “righteousness,” i. e. rectitude of conduct with respect to the injunctions of instituted law.

The two forensic distinctions of these words are remarkably exemplified in the beginning of the 72d Psalm.

1. “Commit thy judgements, O God, unto the King, unto נצדקתך, “and thy justifications to the King’s Son.”

King, and King’s Son, are the same person; described first, simply as King; then, as King by hereditary right. The Psalmist prays, that God would com-

נִצְמָה

צָדִיק

וְמֶלֶךְ מֶלֶךְ

mit

mit to this King the exercise of his whole judicial authority, both in judging, i. e. condemning the wicked, and absolving the godly.

2 “ He will judge thy people, בָּצָדָק, according to equity, and thy poor “ בְּמִשְׁפָּט according to law.”

The first verse is an instance of רְשָׁא, used as a title of Messiah. It is very strange, that Christian expositors, perceiving that “ King” and “ King’s Son,” in the first verse, is one and the same person, should not perceive that this royal person is the King Messiah, not King Solomon. The Targum might have taught them better. “ O God,” says the Chaldee expositor, “ commit the promulgation of thy judgements to the King Messiah, and thy “ justifications to the son of David the King.”

(O) ——— proceed.” This is the force of יָלַכְתָּ, as is explained at large in note (o). The English word “ shall walk” is very inadequate: as it expresses not the going straight forward, without obstacle or turning, to a destined end.

(P) ——— revolters.” בְּשִׁירָה. This word expresses a degree and enormity of disobedience far beyond any thing contained in the notion of “ transgressors, prevaricators,” or any other denomination of guilt, by which the word is rendered in our English Bible. It denotes Rebels, in the highest sense of the word. Such as rise in opposition to the authority of a Sovereign by right, because he is by right a Sovereign. And, in a religious sense, such as wilfully, with premeditation, disobey God from hatred of his authority. אַנְתָּ is a fault committed through inadvertence. יַעַמְדָת is iniquity resulting from a perverse wayward disposition. מַרְתָּ, or מַרְדָּ, generally rendered rebellion, is rather “ provocation,” wilfull disobedience, in particular instances, either of doing something forbidding, or neglecting something commanded; and this often repeated; but, proceeding rather from a reluctance of obedience, with respect to some particular command, than a general settled aversion to what is good. But יַעֲמֵד is beyond all these. It is bold avowed rebellion, or revolt, disowning the authority of the Sovereign, and having for its end the overthrow of his Sovereignty. But it will be said; Who ever was so mad, as to avow or entertain a design or hope of overthrowing the Sovereignty of God? I say, numbers in all ages of the world. Atheists, Deists, Idolaters, and secular powers that persecute

secute revealed Religion. Many of these, indeed, retain the name of a God, or Gods, as signifying, in their conceptions, an *Animus Mundi*, or physical powers in different parts of the material world. But they all disown and oppose the God of the Old Testament, and the New; the God of Jews, and of Christians. And they endeavour what they can to overthrow his authority, by uniting their efforts (in vain, but much in earnest) for the extirpation of the Christian Religion. If those, who, in the present day, are the most forward, and most powerfull, in this work of impiety, affect a partiality for the Jews; it is because they hope to draw them in, to take part in the demolition of Christianity; and, when that is effected, they expect to find in Judaism an easy conquest. Whether any part, or what part, of the Jews may be drawn into this snare of Hell, we presume not to predict. We hope, that the great majority of that race will have too much discretion to be duped. This at least we know, that ultimately the whole race of Israel, of the natural Israel, “will return and “seek the Jehovah their God, and the David their King. They shall re-“turn, and, sitting under his shadow, they will flourish.” The head of the faction leagued against us and them, against our God and theirs, is the Devil. If I am not much mistaken, he is more than once named in Scripture יְנָשָׁא; the participle Benoni Kal being used as an appellative in the singular number, to denote “The Rebel:” “The Apostate.” And the same participle in the plural, which is the word here, denotes the followers of that chief, “Rebels,” “Revolters.”

(Q) This ninth verse, the close of Hosea's written prophecies, much resembles those grave moral γνῶμαι, with which the Greek tragedies are usually closed by the chorus. But for the weightiness of the matter, and the simplicity, brevity, and solemnity of easy unaffected diction, it is not to be equalled by any thing the Attic Muse, in her soberest mood, produced.

HAVING given in my Preface, an enumeration of alterations, in the text of this Prophet, which, though adopted by Archibishop Newcome, I have thought proper to reject; I here subjoin a list of emendations I have myself made; not by mere conjecture, in any single instance, but upon the authority of the most celebrated editions, manuscripts, and antient versions.

		PRINTED TEXT.	EMENDATION.	AUTHORITIES.
CHAP.	II.			
	6.	דרך	דרך	Syr. See (D).
CHAP.	VI.			
	3.	מצאו	מוציאו	Old Printed Texts, and MSS. See note (A).
CHAP.	VIII.			
	5.	נקו	נקו	Complutens. other edit. and MSS. See note (E).
	10.	שרים	ושרים	Editt. MSS. and versions. See (L).
	12.	רבו	רבי	Keri, and MSS. See (N).
CHAP.	IX.			
	2.	בָה	בָם	Best editt. and MSS. See (D).
	8.	אלְהִי — אלְהִי	אלְהִי — אלְהִי	Editt. and MSS. See (L) and (M).
	12.	בְשָׂרִי	בְסָרִי	Editt. MSS. Versions, Houbigant, Newcome. See (S).
CHAP.	X.			
	6.	אותו	אתו	Editt. and MSS. See (K).
	10.	עִנְתָם	עִנְוֹתָם	Keri, and MSS. See (P).
	15.	בְשָׁחַר	כְשָׁחַר	Editt. and MSS. See (T).
CHAP.	XI.			
	2.	מִפְנֵי הָם in 1 word	מִפְנֵי הָם in two	LXX. Syr. Houbig. Newc. See (C)
CHAP.	XII.			
	5.	וַיַּכְלֵ	וַיּוֹכֵל	Editt. MSS. See (C).
CHAP.	XIII.			
	2.	בְתֻבּוֹנָם	כְתֻבּוֹנָם	Best editt. and MSS. See (A).
	5.	תְלָאוֹבָת	תְלָאוֹבָות	Editt. MSS. See (F).
	14.	דְבָרִיךְ	דְבָרֶךְ	Editt. MSS. and Versions. See (V).
CHAP.	XIV.			
	5.	מִמְנוּ	מִמְנִי	The Oriental Synagogue.
	7.	יִשְׁבּוּ יִשְׁבְּיָ	יִשְׁבּוּ יִשְׁבְּיָ	Editt. and MSS. See (F).
	9.	וְזַדְיקִים	וְזַדְיקִים	Editt. and MSS. See (N).

These nineteen are the only emendations of the printed text of Vander Hooght (according to the edition in 8vo, at Amsterdam, 1705, which has for many years been the standard), which I have adopted. They are all, except the 1st and the 12th, supported by a great consent of MSS, and old editions of great authority, and sometimes by the antient versions besides. The 1st indeed rests chiefly upon the Syriac version, and the pressing exigence of the place, but not without countenance from the LXX in the most material part. The 12th is merely a division, of what appears in the printed text as one word, into two, as it was redde by the LXX and Syriac, without the change or transposition of a single letter.

The learned reader will observe, that I seldom take notice of any such various readings (and such make the far greater part of those which the manuscripts present) as give only a varied orthography of a word, without altering, or in any way affecting, either the sense, or the grammatical construction. Such varieties might deserve the attention of an editor, but to a translator they are of little consequence.

I subjoin a list of the passages, in which I have altered the stops.

ALTERATIONS OF STOPS.

Chapter.	Verse.		
IV.	10.	—	See note (H).
VI.	9. 10.	—	See note (L).
VII.	14.	—	See note (M).
	15.	—	See note (M).
VIII.	2.	—	See note (B).
	11. 12.	—	See note (M).
IX.	1.	—	See note (B).
	4.	—	See note (E).
14.	15.	—	See note (W).
X.	7.	—	See note (N).
XI.	4.	—	See note (G).
XIII.	2.	—	See note (C).
	5. 6.	—	See note (G).
10.	11.	—	See note (Q).
14.	15.	—	See note (X).

A P P E N D I X.

APPENDIX.

N^o I.

CORRECTIONS OF THE TRANSLATION,

WITH

ADDITIONAL EXPLANATORY NOTES.

Chap. II. 10.

— vileness —.” Perhaps — “ shame” — might be a better word. See the reason, note (G). Shame is, indeed, the word in the Bishops’ Bible. The impoverishment and devastation of a rich country, by invasion and the depredations of the conqueror, seem to be represented under the image of a total denudation of the female person. Compare Ezek. xvi. 36. 37.

Chap. IV. 12.

Perhaps this whole verse might be better rendered thus: “ My people consult “ their wood, and their staff is their monitor. For a spirit of lasciviousness hath “ driven them astray, and they play the wanton, [withdrawing] from under their “ God.” To be “ under God,” is to be both under his government, and under his care. And “ to withdraw from under him,” is at the same time to revolt from obedience, and to renounce his protection. See note (I), and Appendix, N^o II.

Chap.

Chap. V. 10.

— bounds,” rather — “ land-marks.”

Chap. VI. 8.

— lying in wait for a man.” Perhaps “ — lying in wait for the “ passenger” might be a rendering, which, though less literal, might more clearly convey the meaning to the English reader. For the image is that of a banditti, not lying in wait for a particular man; but generally lying in wait, to take their chance of making booty of any traveller, whose ill hap might throw him in their way.

Verse 9.

— committed lewdness,” rather — “ wrought lewdness,” which was the expression in some of the old versions. For the priests are taxed, not barely with spiritual lewdness, as committed by themselves, but as the promoters and abettors of it among the people.

Chap. VIII. 4.

When I say, in the explanatory note (b), that “ the only Kings of the Israelites, of God’s appointment, were those of the line of David in Judah, “ and of Jeroboam and Jehu in the ten tribes;” I forget not, that Baasha indeed is spoken of, in the First Book of Kings, as an instrument in the hand of God, to execute his judgements upon the house of Jeroboam; and Zimri likewise upon the house of Baasha; and Omri upon that of Zimri. But no one of these seems to have received an express commission for what he did, or an appointment to the kingdom, from any Prophet; such as Jeroboam received from the Prophet Ahijah, and Jehu from Elisha.

Chap. XI. 6.

See N^o II.

N° II.

ADDITIONAL CRITICAL NOTES.

Chap. II. 13.

— her necklace," or, perhaps, her ear-rings. The word חָלִית may be from the root חָלָל, to perforate, of the form of נִפְרִית from נִפְרֵר, and בְּרִית from בְּרִית; and it may signify an ornament of gold or silver, in open work, like what is now called filigramme, which seems to have been in use in the highest antiquity; for such, I think, were the ear-rings of Juno.

Ἐν δὲ ἄρα ἔρμαλα ἦκεν ἐπτρίγγοις τριπόνταις,

Τριγληνα, μορόνηα.

II. 3. 182.

In the pierc'd auricle, on either side,
She fix'd the trembling pendant, triple drop,
Of tender filigramme.

Filigramme — μορόνηα from μείρωμαι, like חָלִית from חָלָל:

Chap. III. 2.

Add to note (B).

St. Jerome, and St. Cyril, of Alexandria, conceiving perhaps that the Prophet, if he had once divorced his wife, could not legally take her home again, imagine, that the adulterous woman of this chapter is a new connexion formed after the dismission of Gomer. And in this opinion they are followed by Estius, Menochius, and Tirinus. Some other expositors of inferior note, taking up with this notion, interpret this second connexion of the Christian Church, considered as a second wife, married after the divorce of the Jewish. To this it may be objected; 1st, that all that pasted between the Prophet and his wife (or wives, if in fact he took more than one), must be expounded by the analogy of God's dealings with the Church, con-

sidered as the wife, in every period ; both when it was composed of the natural Israel only, and since the grafting in of the Gentiles. 2dly, It must indeed be admitted, that a woman, separated by bill of divorce, according to the law, Deut. xxiv. 1—4. after marriage had thereupon with a new husband, if that second marriage came to be dissolved, either by the death of the new husband, or by a formal divorce from him ; could not be taken again to wife by the first husband. But nothing hindered her re-marriage to her former husband, if new espousals with another had not taken place. And further, if no divorce had taken place by bill, the right of the husband over her person, notwithstanding any separation (as we would now speak of bed and board) continued in full force. Now the state of the Jewish nation in the aggregate, even in their outcast forlorn condition, is never represented in the Prophets, as a divorce by bill. The question, in Isaiah li. 1. “ Where is this “ bill of your mother’s divorcement ? ” amounts to a negation of the existence of any such instrument. In Jer. iii. 8. Jehovah says, indeed, of “ backsliding Israel,” that is, of Samaria, that “ he had put her away, and given “ her a bill of divorce.” But nothing of the kind is said of Judah, clearly distinguished in this prophecy from Samaria, and mentioned as her “ sister ; ” that is, her sister, not only in consanguinity, but in the mystical wedlock. And, notwithstanding the bill of divorce, “ backsliding Israel,” no new espousals having taken place after the divorce, is affectionately invited to return to her former husband, who revokes her divorcement^a. Further, it is to be observed, that the Christian Church is never mentioned in prophecy as a second wife. But the converts of the Gentiles are represented under the image of a brood of children acquired to the original wife, pardoned, after a long separation, by the injured husband, taken home again, and into favour. From all this it appears, that, to represent the case between Jehovah and his Church, the adulteress, whom the Prophet is in this chapter commanded to love, must be Gomer herself, the offending wife of the first chapter ; not any other woman. And in this opinion I am confirmed by the authority of Drusius, Lowth the father, and Wells, among ourselves ; of Tarnovius, among the Protestant Divines of the Continent ; and of Ribera and Rivetus, of the Church of Rome. I must observe farther, that Hosea’s marriage was an extraordinary

^a See Jer. iii. 6—14.

transaction,

transaction, under the special direction of an absolute Sovereign, who had full authority to dispense with the forms of any written law; and many things in the treatment of the incontinent wife seem to have been more conformable to the practices and custom of mankind in general, in the earliest ages, than to the particular provisions of the Law of Moses.

Chap. III. 3.

— neither will I with thee.” The negative נִכְנָא is carried over to this from the preceding clause, by the force of the copula. Nothing more common. So that the sense is the same, as if it had been written גַם אַנְּיָה אַלְכָ.

Chap. IV. 11.

When I said that the seven texts, produced in pages 73, 74, “are the only instances in the Bible, in which a noun, or what stands as a noun, following the verb יָבֹא, is connected with the verb by נִכְנָא;” I had overlooked an eighth, in 1 Chron. xvi. 37. in which, taking the passage as it is rendered in our public translation, the immediate object of the verb may seem to be connected with it by נִכְנָא. “So he left there [מִזְבֵּחַ] before the ark of the covenant of the Lord Asaph and his brethren [לְאָסָף וּלְאֶחָיו].” But, upon a critical consideration of the passage, it will appear, that the immediate object of the verb is not “Asaph and his brethren,” but the proper names, in v. 38, 39, 40, 41, 42. And the sense is, that he left those persons *to* Asaph and his brethren; that is, under their direction and superintendance. And the whole should be thus rendered. “So he left there, before the ark of the covenant of Jehovah, under command of Asaph and of his brethren (to minister before the ark continually, as every day’s work required (38) Obed-edom and their brethren threescore and eight: Obed-edom also the son of Jeduthun, &c.” Observe, that the נִכְנָא prefixed to עַבְדָּתָם at the beginning of verse 38, should not be rendered “and,” for it is the particle of specification. “He left under command of Asaph and his brethren, &c. viz. “Obed-edom, &c.” Of this use of נִכְנָא, see p. 53.

Verse 12.

Add-to note (I).

I find I am quite alone in taking this clause, “let their staff therefore give them answers,” as I still think however it may be taken, as a severe

menace of dereliction. I have offered therefore, in N^o I, another translation of this whole verse; in which this clause is given as a repetition only, in other words, of the assertion contained in the former; or, at most, as alleging against the Israelites a specific instance of the crime of idolatry, charged generally in the former clause. In this mention of the staff, as giving oracular advice, some have imagined an allusion to a very antient superstition, mentioned by the grammarian Festus, which consisted in the adoration of a peeled stick, as the symbol of some Deity. And I cannot but think, there is some ground for the conjecture. The Hebrew word **לָקַט**, though given as a root by Buxtorf and most lexicographers, is, by some grammarians, deemed a verbal from the root **לָקַל**, “to polish,” or, “make smooth.” If this be the true derivation of the word, and it is certainly very plausible, its proper sense must be that of a peeled stick, or wand, trimmed by the knife of all the lateral twigs and buds, and divested of the outer bark or rind; and so made perfectly smooth and bare.

τὸ μὲν ἔποις Φύλλα καὶ ὄξες
Φύσει, ἐπειδὴ ταρῶται τομὴν ἐν ὄρεσσι λέλοιπεν,
Οὐδὲ ἀναθηλήσει ταρῆ γέρας ἐν χοελκὶς ἔλεψε
Φύλλα τε καὶ φλοίσν.

Certainly the word is used but once for a growing twig, viz. Jer. i. 11. And it is remarkable, that, in the old Latin language, the name of the deified wand was, according to Festus, a word of similar etymon and import. “**DELUBRUM** dicebant fustem **DELIBRATUM**, i. e. decorticatum, quem venerabantur pro **Deo**.”

Verse 18.

— her great men.” **מִנְתָּה** *her*, i. e. Ephraim’s. Of this anomaly of gender, see the Preface.

Chap. V. 2.

I read, **שְׁטִיף**, not **שְׁטִיף**.

Verse 4.

Of the six passages, in which the LXX are said (p. 81) to have rendered the word **מִלְלָה** by **ἔργα**, I find, upon a re-examination of them all, that two are

are doubtfull: namely, Jer. xxi. 12. and 14. For the different editions of the LXX vary very much. Trommius seems to have had no better authority, for giving ἐργα as the rendering in these two texts, than the Scholia of the Frankfort Septuagint. In the Vatican and the Alexandrine MSS, we have nothing at all in the Greek to render the word מַלְלִילָה^ה: the clauses, in which it occurs in these two verses, being entirely omitted. Grabe supplies the defect, under an asterisk, as from the Hexaplar text; and he gives the word ἐπιτηλεύματα. Under this uncertainty, these two texts of the LXX should be taken as neutral, with respect to any interpretation of the word. But this in no degree affects the result of the disquisition.

Verse 13.

——— the King who takes up all quarrels.”

Add to note (K).

Theodoret understands this King, of the King of Egypt. But I rather think the Assyrian, named in the preceding clause, is introduced again here, not by name, but by character. For in the next clause, it is evidently said of one and the same person, that “he will not be able to repair the damage,” made in Ephraim by the moth; or, “to make a cure of the corrupted sore,” created in Judah by the worm in the flesh.

Verse 15.

——— they will rise early to seek me.” The verb יִשְׁחַרְנִי is plural. Many MSS. give יִשְׁחַרְנוּנִי. It is not unusual, however, for the *crementum* ְ, of the third person plural of verbs, to be dropped before the paragogic ָ, followed by a pronominal suffix: the absence of the ְ being marked, as in this place, by the point Kibbutz under the last radical; אָז יִקְרָאָנִי וְלֹא אָעֵנָה יִשְׁחַרְנִי וְלֹא יִצְאָנִי. In which place, however, the three verbs are all written full in many MSS. Sometimes the ְ is omitted before the suffix not preceded by the paragogic ָ. Indeed, this omission is universally incident to the personal increment ְ, whenever that increment should regularly take place. The second persons plural præt. both masculine and feminine, change their proper termination ּ and ֶ into ְ before the suffixes. But this ְ is often omitted. The 2d and 3d persons plural feminine in the future change their termination נֶה into ְ before the suffixes. And this ְ again is

^a Prov. i. 28.

frequently

frequently omitted. And the omission of the י, in all these cases, is invariably marked by the point Kibbutz under the third radical of the verb.

I take this omission to be a change in the letters of the verbs by the suffixes, originally belonging to the language, independant of the points; and as such it is considered by the great antagonist of the Masoretic punctuation, the learned Masclef.

Chap. VI. 10.

——— a horrible thing.” שְׁעִירִירִיהָ. The form of the noun is certainly very singular. Two MSS give שְׁעָרָוָה, in which form, as Archibishop Newcome observes, the word occurs twice in Jeremiah ^a. But this seems not a sufficient reason for altering the text. The Keri, and many MSS, as the same learned Prelate has remarked, give שְׁעָרָוִיהָ; which confirms the form in the printed text in the most extraordinary part of it; the termination יה—. As for the insertion of the י between the two resh's, this is not uncommon in nouns formed by the re-duplication of the third radical.

Chap. VII. 10.

——— seek him.” בְּקַשְׁרָהּ. Vide supra, V. 15.

Chap. VIII. 7.

——— shall swallow it up.” בְּבַלְעָהוּ. Vide supra, V. 15.

Chap. X. 14.

——— and all thy fortresses shall be demolished.” Observe, that in the original, the singular וְכֹל, not the plural מִבְצָרִיךְ, is the nominative case to the verb שָׁבַע. There is therefore no anomaly of the number.

Chap. XI. 6.

——— weary itself.” Or, —— be weary.” Or, —— fall furiously “upon.” Or, —— play havoc in.”

The verb חָלָה may be either (1st) the third person sing. præterit. in the masculine form of the root חָלָה; or (2dly) the third person sing. præterite in the feminine form of the verb חָלָה; or (3dly) the third person sing. præt. fem. of the verb חָלָה. As the first it will render, “weary itself,” or “be wearied,” if an

^a v. 30. and xxiii. 14.

anomaly of the gender, of which the instances are frequent, be admitted; the noun חַלָּה, which is the nominative case, being feminine.

2. חַלָּה, being taken in the second manner, will give the same sense, if an intercommunity of sense be allowed between חַלָּה and חַלְלָה in the secondary sense of the former, of being exhausted with continued toil.

3. חַלָּה taken in the third manner will render, “— fall furiously upon;” or, “— play havoc in;” which two last renderings come to the same thing.

As for the sense of “resting upon,” or “abiding on,” given in our public translation, and by the majority of interpreters, it is altogether inadmissible. For neither of the roots חַלְלָה nor חַלָּה signifies “to remain, abide, or continue in.” The words, which, in the sense of continuance, or abiding, are placed in the Lexicons under the root חַלְלָה, are some to be referred to the root חַלְלָה; others are misinterpreted, and belong to the root חַלָּה in another sense: none of them to the root חַלְלָה. But to the root חַלְלָה, the word חַלָּה of the text cannot be reduced. The expression in the Bishop’s Bible, and the English Geneva, instead of “abide on,” was “fall on,” which was much better.

Of the two renderings, 1. “weary itself;” or, “be weary.” 2. “fall furiously upon;” or “play havoc in;” either is admissible, and well suited to the context. But, in my own judgement, I abide by the former, as the better of the two.

Verse 7.

— they called them.” קָרְאָה. See V. 15. and viii. 7.

Chap. XIII. note (D).

When I say (p. 149), that the abominable custom of infant sacrifice was more antient in the kingdom of Samaria, than of Judah; I speak strictly of the comparative antiquity of the custom, as among the Israelites themselves. The temple, built by Solomon, to Moloch, was for the gratification of his Ammonite concubines. And they, those foreign women, “burnt incense, and sacrificed in it.” But it appears not, that the King himself, or any of the race of Israel in his time, nor till long after, were partakers in those impious rites. The erection therefore, of this temple, shewed a propensity to this species of idolatry; but was not the beginning of a permanent custom. On the contrary, the worship of the Tyrian Baal, introduced by Ahab, was the beginning of a practice, which, though checked for a short time by Jehu, was

daily

daily gaining ground, in both kingdoms; rose to its height in that of Samaria, about the time of Menahem; and afterwards, in the reign of Ahaz, in the kingdom of Judah.

Chap. XIII. 14.

I have said in note (T) (p. 159), that the Hebrew names of Hell and the Grave, *Sheol* and *Keber*, never are confounded, by the sacred writers. But although *Keber* is never used for *Sheol*, to signify Hell; there are five texts, in which the contrary may seem to have taken place; namely, the use of *Sheol* for *Keber*, to signify the repository of the body, rather than the mansion of the departed spirit. These five texts are, Gen. xlvi. 38.; xliv. 29. and 31.; 1 Kings ii. 6. and 9. But, upon consideration, it will appear, that in every one of these, the thing to be expressed is neither “Hell,” nor “the Grave,” particularly, and as distinct the one from the other, but the state of Death: and this state is expressed under the image of a place of residence of the dead collectively. And for this place, taken in the gross, not as divided into the two separate lodgements of the spirit and the carcase, the word נֶאָשׁ is used. It is therefore very ill rendered by the word “Grave,” even in these texts; and “Hell” would be a better rendering. Because the only general place of residence of the dead collectively is that of the departed spirit. The Grave is no general place, since every dead body has its own appropriate Grave. Perhaps in these instances the word *Sheol* would be best expressed, in English, by a periphrasis, “region of “the dead,” or “dwelling of the dead,” or “the nether regions.”

There is yet a sixth text, Ps. cxli. 7. in which we read, in the English Bible, of “bones scattered at the Grave’s mouth;” but, in the Hebrew, —— “at the mouth of *Sheol*.” This passage is often alleged, as an evident instance of the use of נֶאָשׁ for the Grave. But the fact is, that here we have no mention of the Grave at all. For the Psalmist is clearly speaking of the bones of persons massacred, whose bodies never were in any Grave, but had been left to rot, unburied, upon the surface of the earth. And the mouth of *Sheol* is this surface, considered as the entrance of *Sheol*; which, in the imagery of the sacred writers, as well as of the oldest Greek Poets, is always considered as in the central parts of the earth’s hollow sphere.

————— Τί πραπεν ηρώεσθος
Τῆς μάν, οὐδὲ βαθύστερον ἐντὸ χθονί εἴη βέρεθρον

Εὐθος

Ἐνθα σιδήρειαι τε πύλαι καὶ χάλκεος πόδες,
Τόσσον ἐνερθ' αἰδεῖσιν ὅστον ἔρωνος ἐσ' απὸ γαίης. II. Θ. 15. &c.

It is very curious to remark, by the way, that the Tartarus of Homer, or his dungeon of the damned,

——— ἵν' Ἰαπελός τε Κρόνος τε
“Ημενοι, εἰτ' αὐγῆς ὑπερίορος ἵλιοι
Τέρποι, εἰτ' αὐγμοισι, Βαθὺς δὲ τε τάρπαρος αμυτίς. II. Θ. 479. &c.

the—*craffa caligo inferum* of the old Latin poet, is a pit below Hades: to which in position it bears the same relation, as Earth, the low mansion of Man, to Heaven, the bright and blissfull seat of the Immortal Gods. Whence it is evident, that Homer's Hades was the dwelling of spirits not in punishment. The shell, or crust, of the terraqueous globe, on which we live, is the outer wall of this nether region, consisting, according to this imagery, of two parts; Hades, the uppermost, and Tartarus, below, in the very center. The whole, without distinction of its parts, is denoted by *Sheol*, in the Hebrew language. And the surface of the earth is the outside, or entrance, of this *Sheol* in the Psalmist. The soul, expelled from its case of clay by the weapon of the murderer, flees to *Sheol*, and leaves its exuviae at the entrance. Observe, that in the compound word שֹׁׁל, the noun שׁ does not always retain its proper and literal signification of “a mouth.” It is used, with great latitude, to signify the edge, properly the outside edge, or beginning, of any thing. In this passage, neither LXX, or Vulg. express any allusion to a mouth. Παρὰ τὸν αὐδην. LXX. *Secus infernum.* Vulg.

I have the satisfaction to find, that, with respect to the distinct proper senses of the words *Sheol* and *Keber*, and in the interpretation of the mysterious text in St. Peter's first Epistle, as far, at least; as the general principle is concerned, I have the concurrence of a very learned writer, the Rev. George Bennet, Minister of the Gospel at Carlisle: in a book, entitled, “Olam Hanashemoth; or, a View of the Intermediate State,” which was published about the very time these sheets were committed to the press. It is a work of various erudition, and deep research. And a reader must be very learned, who

finds not much in it to instruct him; very dull, if he is not delighted with the ingenuity that is displayed even in those parts, in which he may see reason to doubt the solidity of the author's argument, and the truth of his interpretations; and very captious, if in a variety of novel expositions, many of which he may think inadmissible, he finds any thing to give him offence. I take a particular pleasure in bearing this testimony to the merits of an author, whom I suspect to be of a different branch of the Christian family from my own, and who seems to have a different notion from mine of the prophecies, relating, as I conceive, to the final restoration of the Jewish nation.

Chap. XIV. 7:

Add to note (H.)

Diodati refers this masculine suffix to God. For having rendered, “la ricordanza d'esso farà come il vino del Libano,” he gives this note: “Vuol dire, la sua conoscenza e dottrina farà sempre dolcissima al suo popolo, a guisa di vino eccellente.” He offers, indeed, another exposition, which refers the pronominal suffix to the people. “Iddio terrà carissima la memoria del suo popolo.” According to the former exposition זכרו is the people's constant remembrance of God: according to the latter it is God's gracious remembrance of his people. Both seem to me forced and unnatural.



N° III.

Chap. I. 7.

— armour.” The original word מַלְטָה seems to be used here as in Chap. II. 18. See the note L upon that place.

Chap. II. 6.

— hedge up.” Upon the suggestion of a very learned critic (as he appears to be) in a periodical publication *, I have restored the word “hedge” of our public translation, ill changed into “stop” in my former edition.

Verse 16.

— thou shalt call me husband, &c.” Upon mature consideration, I have thought it better to give the sense of the words JSHI, BAALI, and BAALIM, in this place in our own language, than to retain the Hebrew words themselves: which, in deference to the example of our public translation, I had done in my former edition. These words are mere appellatives, expressive of certain relations, between those, who are supposed to use them, and those to whom they are applied. The relations, it is true, are allegorical. But the words are used in their plain literal meaning, and as appellatives. Not as appellatives turned, by compounding, into proper names, like the words JEZRAEL, LO-RUHAMA, LO-ANMI, imposed upon certain allegorical personages; that is, upon persons, which if real, are put however to represent other persons, the circumstances of similitude between the type and antitype being pointed out, by *innuendo* as it were, in the signification of the proper name resolved into its component parts. But these are used only as appellations of certain well-known relations in society, by which other relations, real, or imaginary, are adumbrated: a real relation between God and his people; an imaginary

* See Monthly Review, March, 1804.

relation between the people and their idols. And without the common meaning of the words as appellatives, not as proper names, the passage is unintelligible. In a translation, which adequately renders that common meaning, the sense of the passage will be clear; and not made more clear by the introduction of the original words; which can throw no light upon the sense to him, to whom the original language is unknown. In any translation, therefore, all such words as these should be rendered in the corresponding appellatives of the translator's language. I must observe however, that, in this instance, either all three should be translated, or all three retained. The middle way, taken by Castalio, who translates the first two, and retains the third, is the worst of all. For in this way it appears not, how the disuse of the second puts the third entirely out of the mouth of the spouse.

Verses 19, 20.

— to myself, I say, &c." It seems high time, that the ancient particle of asseveration, "Yea," should be laid aside. As the use of it is one of the peculiarities of colloquial phraseology, by which a certain sect is frequently ridiculed upon the stage. Archaisms, once become ludicrous, cease to raise the dignity of style, and should be banished from Holy writ. And yet the particle, "yes," which I had used in my former edition, seems too familiar. I therefore express the asseveration more solemnly by "I say."

Chap. IV. 11.

— to devote themselves to dalliance, &c." The more literal rendering of the Hebrew words, is certainly what I gave in my former edition — "to give attention to."—But the phrase—"to give attention to," in our language, seems to imply a serious application of the mind to some weighty business, or grave pursuit. And it is not without some impropriety applied to a perpetual engagement in those riotous scenes, which destroy all attention. The translation, which I now give, expresses the full sense of the Hebrew words, but without distinctly conveying that particular notion of the voluptuary, which the original contains, as a person making loose pleasures the whole business of his life, and having no employment for the powers of his mind, but in the gratification of his appetites. But as the mere literal rendering would hardly convey that notion to the English reader, who would only be

be struck with the seeming inconsistency of the expression, of "giving attention" to that, by which the very power of attention is taken away; I prefer the translation I now give. Declaring, however, that neither this, nor the former, nor any other version I have been able to form of the Hebrew words, satisfies myself, as answering in every particular to the original.

Chap. V. 3.

At this very moment" Heb. "Surely now"—**כִּי** in this place is rather the particle of asseveration, *Reverā, Profectō*, than the causal conjunction "For."

Verse 4.

In my note upon this passage, p. 78—82, I have said (p. 79.) that from the Poel form of the verb **הָיָה**, two nouns are derived, both signifying, "a little child." I should rather have said, both understood to signify "a little child." But with respect to the latter of the two nouns, the LXX appear to have followed a very different reading, in the only passage in which the word is supposed to be used in this sense, namely, Is. iii. 12. The word, which the LXX found in that place, must have been **מְעוּלָלִים**, which they take as the participle Poel plural, with the suffix of the 2d person, and they render it, "are gleaning thee." Now if this of the LXX be the true reading, then the word **מְעוּלָל** no where occurs in the sense of "little child."

Verse 9.

— working conviction." The grammatical construction I take to be this: that the noun substantive **תֹּכְחָה**, governs the noun substantive, which immediately follows it, **שְׁבָט**, by the preposition **בְּ**; as the verb, from which it is derived, would govern its object. This verb **יִכְחַדֵּשׁ**, from its primary sense of "making manifest, shewing," comes to signify, "to prove," by argument. And thence "to disprove" by argument, "to shew to be in error," or, "in fault," "to refute," "to convince." And from the sense of "convincing," in argument, it acquires the sense of "convincing" by other means. In particular by "punishment," which brings a delinquent to a sense of his folly or his crime. Hence the noun **תֹּכְחָה** signifies punishment, which produces that effect, or is applied for that purpose. The day of "working conviction in the tribes of Israel," is the day appointed in God's counsels, for executing

those judgements, which should bring the hardened Jews to a sense of God's power, his veracity in his threatenings, and their own sin and folly in disregarding the warnings of his prophets. The verb is rendered "work conviction," by Bishop Lowth, Is. ii. 4. From him I borrow the expression. The word "rebuke" of our public translation, which I retained in my former edition, is much too weak for this place, though in some it might be properly used.

Chap. VI. 2, 3.

——— we shall live in his presence, and attain, &c." I place Rebhia only at לפניך, and remove the Soph-Pasuk, to the end of the following word נדעת, with which I make the second verse end; and I begin a new verse, and a new sentence with נרדפה. Thus, understanding the verb נרעה neutrally, I connect the attaining of knowledge with the living in the presence, as the effect with the cause. To live in God's presence, is to live in the communion of his church, receiving the instruction of the Divine word, and the comfort of the sacraments. The attainment of knowledge, that is the true knowledge of God and a right understanding of his word, is the effect of thus living in his presence. And a further effect of the attainment is, a taste and liking for the knowledge so attained, a desire of perpetual proficiency in it, and a voluntary pursuit of it. "Ita nobis veritatis suavitas allubescet, ut perpetuo sequi cupiamus." *Œconomus*.

Chap. VI. 8.

Gilead ———" In my note upon this passage in my former edition, I said that Gilead, the son of Machir, might be the leader of the expedition against a city of the Amorites, which is mentioned Num. xxxii. 39, 40. But it is more probable, that a grandson of that Gilead, bearing the same name, might be that successfull leader. Gilead indeed, the son of Machir, was the great-grandson of the Patriarch Joseph. Moses and Aaron were great grandsons of the Patriarch Levi. But Joseph was so much younger than Levi, that his great grandsons may well be supposed to have lived with the great great grandsons of Levi; that is, with the generation next below Moses and Aaron, and to have had a considerable part in Joshua's wars. And upon this general view of the subject it was, that I thought it not improbable that Gilead, the son of Machir,

Machir, might be the captor of that city of the Amorites, which afterwards bore his name. But when it is recollect'd, that Machir had children born before the death of his grandfather, Joseph *; and that Joseph died not less than 359 years before the Exodus ; it is quite incredible, that any son of Machir's, and hardly credible that any one higher in the pedigree of the family, than one of his great grandsons, should be alive to serve in Joshua's wars.

The latitude in which the Hebrew word for sons is used, and the inaccuracy of the Hebrews in the enumeration of genealogical descents, is in no instance more evident, than in that of the family of Manasseh. In Joshua xvii. 2. the same persons are mentioned as Manasseh's sons, which are mentioned in Num. xxvi. 30, 31, 32, as the sons of Gilead ; i. e. great grandsons are called sons.

Chap. VII. 8.

— mixed himself with the peoples." The word **בָּנִים** in the plural, always signifies the various nations of the earth, the unenlightened nations, in opposition to God's peculiar people, the Israelites. There is indeed a familiar use of the word in common speech, as promiscuously compellative of the individuals of a company ; in which it renders the English phrase "good folks," or "good people." But as applied to bodies politic, it is never used otherwise, than to denote the many nations of the Gentiles, in opposition to the one nation of the Jews. I have therefore thought it necessary to give it in the plural in English, "peoples," though not without some violation of the propriety of the English language, which disowns the word in the plural form. Bishop Lowth in his Isaiah, studious as he was of the purity of his English stile, has taken the same liberty for the same reason.

Chap. VIII. 1.

The cornet at thy mouth be it like the Eagle, &c." To my translation and exposition of this passage, it has been objected by a learned friend, that Eagles never scream. And this I suppose is the opinion of modern naturalists. But of the six species of Eagles, enumerated by Aristotle, the little Black Eagle is the only one, of which he says it neither *cries* nor *croaks*. Of the next species,

* Gen. l. 22.

the Pelargus Montana, he says, that when it carries off dead carrion, it labours much, squalls and cries. Hist. An. Lib. IX. c. 32. Pliny's testimony is more explicit. He says, of the little Black Eagle, that it is the only species, which never screams or cries—*Sola sine clangore, sine murmuratione*—Lib. X. c. 3. Bochart says, that *clangere* is the true Latin verb to express the voice of the Eagle. In this he is supported by the grammarians. Homer's Eagles screamed. Il. M. 207. *Æschylus*'s screamed. Tusc. Quæst. Lib. II. c. 30. If Eagles have left off screaming, it must have been since the time of our first Edward. For when the shores of Caernarvonshire were strewed with the dead bodies of the bards, slaughtered by him, the Welch Eagles made a piteous screaming.

On dreary Arvon's shores they lie,
Smear'd with gore, and ghastly pale;
Far, far aloof th' affrighted Ravens sail,
The famish'd Eagle SCREAMS and passes by.

From antient authorities it should seem, that three different notes, were to be found in different species of the Eagle. 1. A dolefull whining cry, *μυνυρίζειν*, murmuratio. 2. A hoarse croaking sound, *λεληπειν*. 3. A shrill squall, or scream, of furious savage joy. *Βοᾶν*. Clangere, *κλαγγέας*. Hom.

It is not clear to me, that Aristotle says even of the Black Eagle, what he certainly says of no other, that it is absolutely mute: only that its voice is not ominous, being neither dolefull nor hoarse. Certainly they were Black Eagles, which screamed with horror at the fight of the murthered Bards; for Snowdon is inhabited by no other.

However modern naturalists may decide, I think the prophet Hosea is likely to have been in the opinion of Homer, *Æschylus*, Aristotle, Pliny, Bochart, Gray.

Chap. IX. 5.

— All are gone! Total devaftation! The Hebrew sounds literally, as it was given in the former edition. “ For lo they are gone because of devaftation.” That is, they, the people of the land, harrassed with the ravages and exactions of the foreign invader, are fled from their homes to distant regions, and have left the country so thinned of its inhabitants, that the few remaining

remaining in it are not enow to make an attendance at the stated festivals. This same sense, and neither more nor less than this same sense, the words now given express, as I conceive, with more force and perspicuity, to the English reader.

Chap. X. 11.

— shall harrow—.” It is matter of doubt, whether the HARROW was in ancient times, more than in the present, among the implements of husbandry in Palestine. Be that as it may, the two verbs חָרַשׁ and שָׁדַּר unquestionably speak of two different effections, however the same instrument might be employed for both: the one, that which is the proper operation of the plough; the other, that which with us is the proper operation of the harrow. The verb therefore, “ to harrow,” may very well be used to render the Hebrew שָׁדַּר as predicating the work done, by whatever instrument. Indeed “ to harrow” is the only verb in our language, to render the Greek βωλοκοπεῖν, or the Latin *offringere*.

Verse 12.

Sow to yourselves for righteousness, “ that ye may reap.” So Piscator, “ Ut metatis;” and to the same effect Rivetus. Imperativus pro futuro. Sic alio loco “ Accedite ad eum et illuminamini et comedite bonum,” i. e. comedetis.

— according to mercy,” pro ratione Divinæ benignitatis, quæ supra modum compensat. Rivetus.

Verse 13.

Ye have plowed-in wickedness. I think the verb חָרַשׁ here is used in the sense of plowing-in, the seed plowed-in being the object. And so Rivetus understood it. Arando seminasti: nam impietas fuit semen mandatum terræ, bonorum sterili, malorum feraci.

Verse 14.

— and all thy fortresses shall be demolished.” Observe, that in the original the singular noun substantive כָּל, not the plural מְבָצִירִים is the nominative case to the verb תִּשְׂמַח. In this case therefore there is no anomaly of the number.

Verse 15.

— brought to nothing.” In asserting that the roots דָמָה and דָמָם have no connection, I have the misfortune to differ from my late very learned friend Mr. Parkhurst.

Mr. Parkhurst cites Exod. xv. 16. Job. xxx. 27. Psalms xxxv. 15. Jer. xiv. 17. Lam. ii. 18. iii. 49. as passages, in which the verb דמה is used to signify, "to be quiet, still, composed," observing that in the last of these passages, "the final ה is clearly radical." Now in the first of these passages, Exodus xv. 17. the word יְדַמֵּה may be deduced either from רָמֵם or דָמֵה. The Masoretes indeed have pointed it, as if they referred it to רָמֵם. But not to דָמֵה in the sense of רָמֵם, "to be quiet or still," but in its own sense, "to be like to;" - for the passage might very well be rendered "by the greatness of thy arm they shall become like a stone," i. e. petrified with dismay. In the second and third passages, Job xxx. 27. Ps. xxxv. 15. the word is דָמֵו, and nothing, either in the letters or the points, makes it necessary to refer it to דָמֵה rather than to דָמֵו. In the 4th passage, Jer. xiv. 17. the word is תְּדַמֵּנָה; which might be the third person plural feminine of the future tense in Kal either of דָמֵה or רָמֵם; for, in this person, the verbs quiescent Lamed He, and the verbs doubling Ain differ in form in the points only. The Masoretes indeed have applied the points, which, in their system, belong to the verbs quiescent Lamed He. For thus they write it תְּדַמֵּנָה. But this is only one instance among many of their want of judgement. Alter only one of their points, place Kibbutz instead of Scheva under ד, thus תְּדַמֵּנָה, and the word will be the third person plural feminine future in Kal, regularly formed from רָמֵם. In the fifth passage, Lamentations ii. 18. the word is תְּדַמֵּם; which by no exploit of criticism whatever can be reduced to דָמֵה, a root quiescent Lamed He. It must be the third person future feminine Niphal of the verb רָמֵם, and nothing else. Of the six passages, therefore, produced by Mr. Parkhurst, there remains only the sixth, Lam. iii. 49, in which any necessity, or propriety indeed, appears of introducing the root דָמֵה in the sense of דָמֵו, or רָמֵם. In the first indeed the root may be דָמֵה, but in its own sense.

In Lamentations iii. 49, the word is תְּדַמָּה. In which Mr. Parkhurst says the ה is clearly radical. But I cannot agree with him. The word, disregarding the points, may be the third person sing. fem. future of the root רָמֵם in Kal, with the paragogic ה. The verbs, doubling Ain, in the persons both of the future and the præterite, frequently assume the paragogic ה. And of this we have an instance in this very verb, in another passage of the prophet Jeremiah. See Jer. viii. 14. It is certain, that many roots quiescent Lamed He, doubling

doubling Ain, and quiescent Ain Vau, have an intercommunity of signification. But this is not to be extended to all such verbs at pleasure, but confined to those, of the promiscuous use of which we have unexceptionable instances in the sacred text.

Chap. XI. 10.

— Like a Lion he shall roar, &c." The most learned Commentators agree, that this roaring of the Lion is the sound of the Gospel; and that the subject of this, and the following verse, is its promulgation and progress, the conversion of the Gentiles, and the final restoration of the Jews. "*Quasi Leo rugiet*—Clarâ et maximâ voce prædicabit Evangelium, says Piscator. And to the same effect Rivetus and Bochart. "Ut Leo rugitu suo advocat animalia sui generis ad participationem prædæ, teste Plutarcho in Libro de Industriâ Animalium; sic Christus, potenti Evangelii voce, vocabit Gentes omnes ad æternæ vitæ societatem." Livelye. The preaching of the Gospel, reaching the remotest corners of the earth, is frequently represented under the image of the loudest sounds. And this loudness of the sound alone might justify the figure of the roaring of the Lion. But a greater propriety of the figure will appear, if we recollect, that the first demonstrations of mercy to the faithfull will be the judgements executed upon the anti-christian persecutors: to whom the sound of the Gospel will be a sound of terror. This seems to have been the notion of Drusius; who says, "Ut rugitus Leonis terret reliqua animalia, sic Deus omnibus metum incutiet, cum supplicium sumet de hostibus Ecclesiæ." And this receives much confirmation from a passage in the prophet Joel (III. 16.) in which, as Rivetus observes, the preaching of the Gospel is described as Jehovah's roaring from Sion. And although the Lion is not mentioned by name in that place, yet the word for roaring is that, which properly denotes the voice of the Lion. This, therefore, is another passage, in which the roaring of the Lion represents the preaching of the Gospel. And as such it is mentioned by the great Bochart. "Non immerito rugitus hic (nempè Joel III. 16.) ut et Of. XI. 10. appellatur Evangelii prædicatio; cum tam sit clara et sonora, ut per totum orbem audita fuerit, nec solum aures, sed auditorum animos, vi suâ perculerit."

Verse 11.

— shall hurry," pavebunt, vel properabunt celeriter se recipere ad eum, nempè Christum. Vatablus. Such is the consent of the most learned interpreters in the general sense of this passage, as a prophecy of the successfull propagation of the Gospel. And in this general sense of it even they agree, as appears by St. Jerome upon the place, who look not for a final restoration of the natural Israel: although in the detail they must differ from those, who maintain, as I maintain, the literal fense of the prophecies relating to that great consummation of the scheme of Providence.

Chap. XII. 1.

"Every day he multiplieth falsehood and destruction," i. e. in multiplying his falsehoods, he multiplies the causes of his own destruction. The proposition is true, whether the falsehood be understood of their hypocrisy and infidelity towards God, or of their treachery and bad faith in political treaties and alliances. Multiplying their falsehoods in either way, they were daily multiplying the causes of their own destruction. But from what immediately follows, their falsehood in their alliances seems more particularly intended. They are charged with making their court to the Egyptian; at the very time when they were entering into treaty with his enemy and rival the Assyrian.

— For while—*at the same time*—” This I take to be the force of the two *vaus*, prefixed the one to the noun ברית, the other to the noun טעם.

Verse 7.

Canaan the Trafficker!"—In my former edition I had given it more tamely. “A Trafficker of Canaan!” For the improvement in the spirit of the expression, which is very great, my reader, with myself, is indebted to the learned critic already mentioned *.

Chap. XIII.

Verse 15.

— Nay in truth.” This I take to be the true force of נ in this place. Equivalent to *Imo* or *Quinimo*. “Nay truly,” or “nay rather,” or “nay and what is more.” Instead of shewing signs of penitence, he is become a total and professed apostate.

* Monthly Review, March, 1804.

INDEX OF AUTHORS AND OTHER PERSONS.

A.

ABARBANEL, page 91. 113. 138.
156.

Aben Ezra, 69.

Aben Walid, 127.

Achan, 7. 32.

Achilles, 110.

Æschylus, 112. 169.

Agamemnon, 112. 171.

Ahab, 31. 43. 54. 115. 116. 149. 199.

Ahaz, 9. 19. 28. 149. 151. 200.

Ahijah, 192.

Antichrist, 3.

Aquila, 81. 85. 86. 91. 97. 99. 119.
120. 121. 156. 160.

Arias Montanus, 57. 139. 155.

Avenarius, 136.

B.

Baal, 149. 199.

Baasha, 192.

Balaam, 169.

Basil (St.), xvi.

Bate (Julius), 67. 172.

Bennet (George), 201.

Bishop's Bible, xxxiii. 74. 93. 119.
138. 143. 179. 191. 199.

Blaney (Dr.), 73. 83. 84. 122. 125.

Buxtorf, 53. 98. 114. 123. 136. 196.

C.

Calafio, 79. 139.

Calvin, 10. 51. 57. 64. 71. 89. 93.
102. 107. 116. 126. 139. 143.

Capellus, 12. 129.

Capito, 102.

Castalio, 51. 53. 57. 129. 145.

Chaldee. See Jonathan, Onkelos,
Targum.

Chryses, 171.

Cicero, 43. 76. 110.

Clytemnestra, 112.

Cocceius, 139.

Coverdale, 179.

Cyril (St.) of Alexandria, xvi. 59. 71.
130. 137. 193.

D.

De Rossi, 72. 85. 92. 99. 102. 116.
119. 130. 136. 146. 160.

D d 2

Diodati,

Diodati, xiii. xviii. 57. 116. 119. 129.
139. 140. 171. 181. 202.

Drusius, 10. 57. 69. 71. 72. 76. 77.
86. 89. 95. 101. 102. 126. 128.
129. 180. 194.

E.

Elias, 136.

Elijah, 31. 54.

Elisha, 192.

English Geneva Bible, xviii. 74. 93.
139. 199.

Esius, 193.

Eucherius, 52.

Eusebius, 89.

F.

Festus, 196.

Forerius, 177.

G.

Gideon, 65. 130.

Gilead, 90.

Grabe, 197.

Grotius, xv. 57. 59. 76. 96. 97. 98.
113. 129. 139. 176. 177.

H.

Hector, 10.

Herodotus, 14. 118. 119.

Hesychius, 118.

Hezekiah, 67. 170.

Homer, 110. 139. 145. 171. 193. 196.
200. 201.

Hoshea, 24. 25. 34. 149. 150.

Houbigant, xvi. 10. 12. 51. 53. 57.
60. 61. 70. 76. 85. 95. 119. 133.
134. 143. 145. 167. 179. 180.

Hutchinson (John), 67. 105. 182. 183.

J.

Jehoshaphat, 170.

Jeju, 54. 192. 199.

Jeroboam, 22. 43. 192.

Jerome (St.), xvii. xix. xxi. xxx. 2.
56. 57. 85. 86. 88. 89. 91. 92.
97. 99. 104. 119. 121. 123. 130.
131. 156. 160. 165. 171. 193.

Jezabel, 31. 54.

Jonathan, 51. 57. 85. 86. 88. 89. 99.
105. 123. 126. 128. 132. 139.
141. 152. 153. 155. 156. 157. 180.

Josephus, 111.

Josiah, 67.

Junius and Tremellius, 51. 57. 72.
129. 139.

K.

Kennicott (Dr.), 72. 85. 92. 99. 102.
116. 119. 124. 130. 133. 142.
146. 153. 154. 160. 179. 182.

Kimchi, 102. 123. 138. 141. 173.

L.

Laban, 66.

Le Clerc, 174.

Livelye, xv. 10. 57. 58. 64. 69. 76.
101. 124. 127. 136. 179.

Lowth

Lowth (the Father), xiii. xix. 76. 194.
 Lowth (Bishop), xxviii. xxix. 38. 86.
 91. 100. 141. 176. 177.
 Luther, 6. 10. 49. 51. 56. 72. 116.
 117. 127. 129. 139. 143. 145.
 Lyra, 141.

M.

Machir, 90.
 Masclef, 198.
 Maforetes, 80. 102. 107. 108. 128.
 132. 147. 177. 180.
 Maundrell, 49.
 Mede (Joseph), 174.
 Menahem, 19. 23. 24. 25. 200.
 Menochius, 193.
 Mercer, xv. 141. 183.
 Micali, 68.
 Miriam, 170.
 Moncœius, 67.
 Moloch, 149. 199.
 Munster, 88. 126. 141.

N.

Naboth, 54.
 Nebuchadnezzar, 66.
 Newcome (Abp.), xxxiv. 10. 12. 38.
 51. 57. 61. 70. 72. 73. 76. 97. 119.
 125. 129. 130. 134. 137. 142.
 172. 173.
 Niebuhr, 49.
 Nissim (Rabbi), 155. 156.
 Noldius, 53. 93. 99. 113. 140.

O.
 Ecolampadius, 102. 141.

Omri, 192.
 Onkelos, 152. 153.
 Oriental Synagogue, 179.
 Orphic Hymns, 103. 104. 117. 118.

171.

P.

Parkhurst, 64. 80. 88. 94. 106. 118.
 121. 131. 135. 136. 169.
 Patroclus, 110.
 Pekah, 2. 24. 28.
 Pekahiah, 34.
 Pocock (Dr. Edward), xxiv. 10. 19.
 28. 55. 67. 68. 76. 85. 91. 95. 96.
 102. 113. 114. 116. 120. 129. 179.
 Poole, 133.
 Procopius, 105.
 Pul, 23. 28.

R.

Rahab, xiv.
 Ribera, 194.
 Rivetus, 70. 161. 194.
 Robertson, 129.

S.

Salmon the Just, xiv.
 Sarpedon, 139.
 Scott, 108.
 Secker (Abp.), 72. 136.
 Sennacherib, 3.

Septuagint,

Septuagint, xxxiii. 51. 57. 61. 64. 69. 70. 75. 81. 85. 88. 90. 91. 96. 99. 102. 105. 107. 119. 120. 121. 123. 125. 128. 129. 130. 131. 132. 134. 136. 137. 138. 140. 141. 143. 151. 152. 156. 161. 163. 166. 175. 178. 196. 201.

Shallum, 24.

Shalmanezer, 2. 34.

Sixth Greek, 96.

Solomon (King), 149. 170. 184. 199.

Solomon (Rabbi), 139.

Sophocles, 112.

Spencer (Dean), 66. 67. 100. 112.

Spenser, 77.

Stephens (Henry), 118.

Symmachus, 85. 86. 87. 90. 96. 97. 120. 121. 156. 160.

Syriac, 57. 61. 64. 85. 88. 89. 90. 91. 96. 99. 105. 107. 120. 121. 123. 125. 128. 129. 131. 134. 138. 140. 141. 143. 145. 151. 152. 156. 157. 161. 164. 165. 180.

T.

Talmud (Babylonian), 99.

Tanchum (Rabbi), 19. 85. 96. 127. 138. 141. 155. 156.

Targum, 184.

Tarnovius, 126. 194.

Theodoret, xvi. 197.

Theodotion, 81. 85. 86. 97. 99. 120.

Tiglath-pileser, 2. 23. 42.

Tirinus, 193.

Trommius, 197.

Tyndale, xxxiii.

V.

Vatablus, 10. 64. 122. 126. 141.

Virgil, 111. 145.

Vitrunga, 62. 63. 67. 88. 89. 119.

Ulysses, 139.

Vulgate, 51. 57. 70. 84. 85. 86. 88. 89. 90. 91. 92. 95. 97. 99. 105. 107. 119. 121. 123. 125. 128. 129. 130. 131. 136. 141. 156. 157. 160. 180. 201.

W.

Wells (Dean), xiii. xvi. xix. xxvii. 24.

32. 57. 149. 150. 151. 194.

Wheeler (Dr.), 19. 102.

White (Samuel), 176.

Woide, 124.

Z.

Zalmunna, 130.

Zanchius, 102.

Zechariah, 24.

Zimri, 192.

Zorobabel, 59.

INDEX OF TEXTS

CITED, and occasionally ILLUSTRATED, in the NOTES upon HOSEA.

N. B. The Texts which are particularly explained, or illustrated, are distinguished by an asterisk.

GENESIS.		Chap. xxi. 3.	62	Chap. xxiv. 3.	168
Chap. ii. 7.	Page 114	xxiii. 8.	182	8.	37
v. 1.	xxxiii	xxiv. 3—7.	xiv	*15.16. 168.169	
vi. 4.	ibid.	5.	173	xxxii. 39. 40.	90
xviii. 24.26.28.	182	xxv. 13.14.15.	139	xxxiii. 28.	117
xx. 3.	62	LEVITICUS.		DEUTERONOMY.	
xxxi. 19.	66	Chap. iv. 24.	58	Chap. ii. 7.	153
xxxv. 3.	143	v. 2.	62	iv. 8.	182
18.	106	xvii. 7.	}	vii. 6.	xiv
xli. 45. 50.	107	xviii. 3.		xvi. 19.	182
*xlii. 28.	200	xx. 17.	88	xxiv. 1—4.	199
xliii. 27. 29.	63	xxi. 1—3.	110	*xxvi. 13—15.	112
*xliv. 29. 31.	200	xxvi. 1.	68	14.	107
xlvi. 20.	107	NUMBERS.		17—19.	xiv
xlix. 10.	37	Chap. iv. 6.	146	*xxxii. 10.	31
11.	126	vi. 23—26.	170	*24. 160.161	
EXODUS.		xi. 8.	77	*xxxiii. 7. 37. 132.	
Chap. iii. 15.	144	xii. 8.	52	134.	
*xv. 26.	137	xxiii. 7.	168. 170	JOSHUA.	
xviii. 26.	98	*18.19.	169	Chap. viii. 20.	132
xix. 8.	xiv	22.	37	xxiv. 14.	xiii
25.	61			16.	73
				24.	xiv
				JUDGES.	

JUDGES.		2 CHRONICLES.		Psalm lxxvii. 12.	73
Chap. viii. 16.	114	Chap. vi. 12—42.	170	lxxviii. 7.	81
27—28.	65	xiv. 5.	104	51.	97. 106
xvii. 3.	135	xx.	170	*lxxxii. 6.	172
xx. 45.	78	xxix. 30.	170	lxxxix. 10.	82
		xxxii. 24.	61	19.	61
1 SAMUEL.		31.	73	*48.	176
Chap. ii. 18.	65	xxiv. 4.	104	*xci. 6.	160
xiv. 14.	126			ci. 5.	97
xv. 23.	67	EZRA.		cii. 5.	120
xix. 13 and 16.	66	Chap. iii. 10. 11.	170	cxix. 63.	76
xxii. 18.	65	viii. 22.	60	cxxxix. 3.	126
				cxxxv. 13.	144
2 SAMUEL.		ESTHER.		19—21.	<i>ibid.</i>
Chap. iii. 14.	63	Chap. iii. 4.	61	*21.	122
xiv. 4.	61	iv. 10.	<i>ibid.</i>	cxxxviii. 6.	114
xx. 19.	70	vi. 4.	<i>ibid.</i>	*cxli. 7.	200
*xxiii. 1.	96			cxlv. 6.	61
1 KINGS.		JOE.			
Chap. ii. 6. 9.	200	Chap. iii. 22.	101	PROVERBS.	
viii. 22—53.	170	xvi. 15.	78	Chap. i. 28.	197
		*xix. 23—25.	53	iii. 8.	137
2 KINGS.		*xx. 10.	108	*viii. 13.	82. 83
Chap. ix. 7.	54	xxii. 6.	61	*xi. 7.	103. 106.
x. 30.	55	xxxviii. 11.	82	*17.	88
xii. 8.	136			xix. 7.	147
xvi. 2. 3.	149. 151	PSALMS.		xx. 11.	81
xvii. 1. 2.	150	Psalm iv. 5.	60	xxii. 8.	107
17.	149	*xii. 5.	172	xxvii. 18.	73
xviii. 4.	67	xvi. 10.	73		
xxiii. 5.	104	xxix. 9.	60	ISAIAH.	
24.	67	*xlvi. 4.	84	Chap. i. 13.	97
		xlix. 11.	73	23.	76
1 CHRONICLES.		lxxi. 10.	60	iii. 8.	81
Chap. xvi. 37.	195	*lxxii. 1. 2.	183. 184	Chap. iii.	

Chap. iii. 10.	81	Chap. x. 24.	125	Chap. xxxi. 11.	134
12.	79	*xii. 5.	84	xxxii. 21.	<i>ibid.</i>
v. 14.	117	xvi. 5—8.	109	xxxiii. 13	60
xiii. 21.	168	7.	110		
xv. 3.	147	xxi. 12.	81. 197	DANIEL.	
*xvi. 6.	83	14.	<i>ibid.</i>	Chap. xii. 3.	183
7.	147	xxii. 12.	58		
xvii. 5.	91	*xxiii. 5. 6.	183	JOEL.	
11.	<i>ibid.</i>	14.	198	Chap. i. 8.	62
xviii. 6.	73	15.	115	*iii. 13.	22. 91
xix. 18.	171	31. 32.	<i>ibid.</i>		
xxv. 8.	163	xxvi. 13.	81	AMOS.	
xxvi. 10.	78	xxx. 11.	125	Chap. iv. 9.	120
xxvii. 8.	168	23.	94	v. 5.	105. 107
*xxviii. 2.	160. 161	xxxi. 32.	63	22.	178
xl. 19.	135	xliv. 22.	81	*vi. 8.	84
*26.	103. 105	*xlviii. 29.	83	vii. 10.	97
29.	105	38.	147	*viii. 7.	84
*xliv. 5.	100	*xlix. 19.	84	JONAH.	
10.	135	1. 27.	173. 175	Chap. *ii. 10.	74
*xlv. 18.	176	*44.	84	iv. 7.	120
xlix. 15.	79				
li. 1.	194	LAMENTATIONS.		MICAH.	
*lvii. 13.	99	Chap. *iii. 11.	75	Chap. ii. 11.	115
*19.	176—178	v. 20.	74		
lxv. 18.	<i>ibid.</i>			NAHUM.	
lxvi. 3.	104	EZEKIEL.		Chap. i. 14.	135
		Chap. xiv. 9.	115		
		xvi. 36. 37.	191	HABAKKUK.	
JEREMIAH.		xvii. 5.	136	Chap. ii. 18.	135
		xxi. 21.	66		
Chap. ii. 2.	xiii	35.	58	ZEPHANIAH.	
iii. 6—14.	194	xxii. 6.	126	Chap. iii. 9.	172
v. 3.	136	*xxiv. 17.	111		
30.	198	xxx. 17.	118	ZECHARIAH.	
		E e		Chap. i. 4.	79
				X. 2.	105
				Chap.	

Chap. *xi. 3.	84	ROMANS.	HEBREWS.
ii.	72	Chap. ix. 24.	Chap. *xiii. 15. 174—
		*25. 26.	176. 178
MALACHI.		26.	ST. JAMES.
Chap. iii. 9	147	xi. 12. and 15.	Chap. *v. 7. 87
iv. 1. (Hebr.			ST. PETER.
iii. 19.)	73	1 CORINTHIANS.	Chap. *ii. 10. XXV. 59
TOBIT.		Chap. *xv. 55. 162—166	*iii. 19. 158
Chap. *iv. 17.	111	2 CORINTHIANS.	APOCALYPSE.
ECCLESIASTICUS.		Chap. v. 8.	Chap. iii. 12. 100
Chad. xxxix. 24.	50	PHILIPPIANS.	vi. 8. 159
BARUCH.		Chap. i. 23.	xiii. 16. 100
Chap. vi. 43.	14	2 THESSALONIANS.	xiv. 1. <i>ibid.</i>
		Chap. ii. 11.	*15. 16. 22
			*18. 20. <i>ibid.</i>
			xx. 13. 14. 159

INDEX OF HEBREW WORDS AND PHRASES

EXPLAINED IN

THE NOTES UPON HOSEA.

א	בָּקָ	בֵּין	בֵּין	בֵּין	דָּבָר	דָּבָר	דָּבָר
אדִי	Page 156	בֵּין		181	דָּבָר	161. 162	
102. 103—105. 106.		בֵּל		91	דָּבָרִים	121	
	108	בַּמִּקְוָם אֲשֶׁר		57	דָּוָם	131	
אָנוֹנִים	103. 106. 108	בָּעֵל		62	דָּם	ibid.	
אִישׁ	62	בְּקֻעָ		155	דָּמָה	ibid.	
אִיפּוֹא	156	בְּשָׁנָה		123	דָּמָם	ibid.	
אַךְ	70				דָּעָ	70	
אַל	51. 69				דָּעָה	ibid.	
אָם	70						
אָמְנוֹנָה	63	גָּאָה		82—85			
אָמַר	60	גָּאָה		ibid.			
אָנָה	102. 106	גָּאוֹן		ibid.	הַבְּהָבִים	101	
אָנָן	106	גָּאִים		82	הַכְּרָ	64	
אָסָר	25. 126	גָּבָר		139			
אָרֶשׁ	63	גָּדָר		61	רִ	53. 157. 195	
אָשֶׁר	180	גָּהָה		86	וְנָם	149	
אַתְּ	93	גָּוָר		94. 122	וְהִי בַּיּוֹם הַהוּא	56	
אַתְּנָה	62	גָּפָן		62			
		גָּפָן בָּקָ		121			
בּ		גָּרָה		94			
בּ	51. 52. 92	גָּרָר		ibid.	וְכָר	144	
בְּדִים	138	גָּשָׁם		87	זְרֻעָ	xvii—xix	

ח		לנפשים		ס	
חול	199	לפי	201	סור	75
חטא	184	לקח	136	סדר	<i>ibid.</i>
חכם	181			סודר	<i>ibid.</i>
חלה	138. 198. 199			סר	76
חלית	193	מ-	113. 174	סתם	199
חלל	199	מור	86		ע
חסד	88. 89	מחכד	113	עגל	122
הצב	88	מלחמה	63	ענלה	<i>ibid.</i>
		מלך	183	ענלות	<i>ibid.</i>
ינר	94	מלךוש	87	על	78. 79
ידע	70. 151. 153. 181	מעולל	79	עלים	79
יורה	87	מעיר	92	ועלל	<i>ibid.</i>
יחל	199	מעללים	78—82	עון	184
יכל	97	מענה	126	עונות	126. 128
לא יכול	<i>ibid.</i>	מצא	116	עובד	72—74. 195
ילד	xxxiii	מצבה	68	על	79. 95. 96. 116.
ילך	50. 179. 184	מצדיק	182		125. 155
ישראל	125	מקל	196	לא-על	94—96
יצג	61	מורד	184	עליה	78. 80
ירב	86	מרה	<i>ibid.</i>	עלות	79
ירש	113. 114	מרחוב	76	על כנ	74
ישראל	181	משבר	157	על	78. 79. 80
		משפט	89. 183	ענה	63. 126
				ערם	61
כ-	91			עש	85
כאשר ראוי	119			עשה	91
כחש	92	נבלה	62	עשך	145
כל	146. 147	נד	74		
כליל	<i>ibid.</i>	נו	143		
		נחותים	140	פחד	69
ל		נכיה	120	פי בסת	118
ל-	92. 125. 126. 195	נקיוון	97	פועל	91
לא	195	נשא	57	פער	117
לאב	153	נתיבות	62	פקד	55
				פרי	

פָּרִי	173—176	קָצֵף	124	שְׁלֹום	177. 178
פָּרִים	<i>ibid.</i>	קָצֵר	91	שְׁלִים	<i>ibid.</i>
פְּשָׁט	61	קָצֵר קְמָה	<i>ibid.</i>	שֵׁם	89. 155
פְּשָׁע	184	קָצֵר חֲטָיִם	<i>ibid.</i>	שְׁמָר	72. 74
	א			שְׁעָרִירָה	198
צְדִיק	182	רָחֵם	xx	שְׁפָה	171. 172
צְדִיקִים	<i>ibid.</i>	רְחַטִּים	140	שְׁרִים	85
צְדָק	184	רְפָא	86. 137	שְׁתָם	169
צְדָקָה	183	רְבָב	85		
	כ		ש		ה
קְבֻּצָּה	99	שָׁאוֹל	158. 200	תָּאָנָה	62
קְבֻּרָה	159. 200	שְׁבָב	98	תְּחִתָּאָשָׁר	57
קְרִים	168	שְׁבוּ	94	תִּירְשׁ	102
קָחָה	136	שְׁוֹטֵט	77	תְּלָאֹוֹת	153
קְטָבָה	160. 161	שְׁטִים	<i>ibid.</i>	תְּנָהָה	99
				תְּרִגְלָתִי	135

INDEX OF THINGS.

A.

ἌΔΗΣ.

Hades equivalent to the Hebrew
Sheol — p. 157
But not the place of the
damned — 201

ANTICHRIST.

The destruction of him pre-
dicted — 3

Ass.

Wild-Afs. Selfishness of the
animal — 27

B.

BAAL-PEOR.

The Artemis, or Prothyraea, of the
Greeks. The Juno Lucina of
the Latins — 117

The Divinity worshipped at Bu-
bastis — *ibid.*

Not Dionysus, nor Priapus 119

BENJAMIN.

Small proportion of the whole

tribe, which survived the war
of Gibeal — 35

BETH-ARBEL.

Shalman's destruction of Beth-
Arbel a fact not recorded in
history — 129

BREAD OF MEN.

What — 111

BUBASTIS.

Name both of an Egyptian city,
and the Divinity worshipped
there — 118

Obscenity of the rites *ibid.*

Obscene emblematical figure,
whence the idol had its name
ibid.

A title of Isis — *ibid.*

BUSBATOS.

Thracian name of Diana 118

BUXTORF.

His distinction, in the construc-
tion of a finite verb with its
infinitive, unfounded 53

C. CALF.

C.

CALF.

Jeroboam's Calves, mutilated imitations of the Cherubic emblems — ix
Idolatry of the Calves an original invention of the Israelites 26. 97

The Calf at Bethel the principal idol — 122

See HUMAN.

CAPTIVITY,

Babylonian, return from; not the restoration predicted by Hosea, chap. i. 10, 11, 59
Small numbers of the returned captives — 59. 60

CHRISTIANS

Marked their persons with the name of Christ, or the sign of the cross — 100

CHURCH.

The Christian, never represented under the image of a second wife — 194

CONJECTURAL EMENDATIONS

Not to be admitted xxxiv
Except with restriction to certain cases specified xxxviii
Pocock's judgement of them 129

CORRUPTIONS

Of the sacred text erroneously supposed to be a cause of obscurity — xxxiv

CUP OF CONSOLATION.

What — 110

D.

DELUBRUM.

In the old Latin a name for a deified stick — 195

DIONYSUS.

Not Baal Peor — 119

DIVORCE.

Divorce by bill hindered not a re-marriage, if espousals to another husband had not taken place — 194
The rejection of the Jews never represented under the image of divorce by bill — *ibid.*

E.

EGYPT.

Living animals worshipped in Egypt, not images of them 98

EMENDATIONS.

List of rejected emendations xl—xliii

List of emendations received 186

ENALLAGE.

Of the absolute and construct states, how solved 173
— in some cases admitted *ibid.*

ESDRINE

Edition. Since the captivity the only source of authentic texts xxxvi

EPHOD.

EPHOD.	—	64. 68.	
Principal part of the High Priest's robes	—	65	
Principal part of the dress of some idolatrous images	<i>ibid.</i>		
The word used by Metonymy for the image itself	<i>ibid.</i>		
EPMA.			
Ἐρμα τῷ ληνῷ, a great warrior, why so called	—	139	
F.			
FILIGRAMME.			
Ornaments in filigramme of the highest antiquity		193	
FORMS OF PRAYER			
In use in the earliest ages both among the Jews and the Heathen	—	270. 271	
FRUIT OF THE LIPS,			
A Scripture phrase expounded by St. Paul, without allusion to Hosea	—	175	
In what passage of the Old Testament the phrase is really to be found	—	176	
FUNERAL RITES	109, &c.		
FURROWS.			
Tethered down to two furrows, a proverbial expression	127		
G.			
GENDER. See NUMBER.			
GIBEAH.			
Lots of the 11 confederate tribes,			
in that war, comparatively small			
	—	35	
GILEAD.			
A city built by Machir's son Gilead	—	90	
The same afterwards called Ramoth Gilead	—	<i>ibid.</i>	
The name of a large tract of country	—	<i>ibid.</i>	
GILGAL.			
The place of the first offence of the Israelites in the Holy Land			32
A place of worship in the days of Samuel	—	33	
Afterward a place of resort for idolatrous purposes	<i>ibid.</i>		
GOD.			
The excellency of Jacob, or of Israel	—	84	
H.			
HABIT.			
How ascribed to God		81	
HARVEST.			
Not a type of judgement		21	
Used for the ripe fruit of the vine	—	91	
HEBREW TEXT.			
Corrupt state of it before Ezra's revision	—	xxxvi	
HELL.			
The proper sense of the word Misap-	46.	158	

Misapplication of it in the English Bible — *ibid.*

The Hell into which our Lord descended — 158

Hell and Death jointly personified — 159, 163

HIPHIL.

Hiphil future of verbs quiescent
Phie Jod — 113

HOSEA.

Probable duration of his ministry and life — v

He belonged to the kingdom of Judah — vi. xxiii

Principal subject of his Prophecies — vi. xxv

His particular character as a Prophet — vii

His stile — xxx

Causes of its obscurity — xxix—xxxiv

Metrical division of his composition lost — xlili

His marriage a real transaction — viii. xv

The incontinent wife a type of the whole Jewish people *ibid.*

Her incontinence commenced before her marriage — xiii

The Prophet's treatment of her not strictly conformable to the rules of the Mosaic law 195

Her three children types of three several divisions of the people — xvi

HUMAN.

Human sacrifice, the custom more antient in the kingdom of Samaria, than of Judah 149, 199

Human victims sacrificed to the Calves — 148—150

The practice not introduced by Hoshea — 150, 151

I and J.**JACOB.**

Excellency of. The temple so called — 84

God so called — *ibid.*

JAREB.

The King of Assyria so called 18, 86, 197

IDOLATERS

Always persecutors 56

Marked themselves with the name of their God 100

IDOLATRY.

Originally what — ix

Progress of in the ten tribes 43, 148—151

Jews not untainted with it, after the return from the Babylonian captivity — 8

JEHU,

Not criminal in the destruction of Ahab's family 54

F f**JEWS.**

JEWS.

Their final restoration a principal article of Prophecy
xxvi—xxvii

JEZRAEL.

Of the city and the plain 53
Etymology and import of the mystical name of Hosea's son
xvii—xix
Signification of the type xvii.
9. 58

Blood of Jezrael 1. 54—56

IMAGES,

Graven and molten the same thing — 134

INFINITIVE.

Construction of the infinite with the finite verb 53.

JOB,

Book of. True cause of its obscurity — xxix

ISIS

Worshipped under the title of Bubastis — 118

ISRAEL.

Prediction of union of Israel and Judah not fulfilled in the return from the Babylonian captivity — 59

Children of and House of, expressions of different import 9

Excellency of Israel. God so called — 16. 84

JUNO.

Her ear-rings — 193

JUST ONE,

A title of Christ — 182

KENNICOTT (Dr.).

Use of his collations xxxix

KING,

A title of Messiah 183
King and King's Son, one and the same person *ibid.*

L.

LEBANON.

Fragrance of its greens 49
Excellence of its vines *ibid.*

LETTERS.

Similarity of in the Hebrew alphabet, misapplied as an argument for conjectural emendation — xxxix. 152

LIP.

Peculiar sense of the word when used in Scripture by metonymy — 171. 172

LO-AMMI.

Mystical name of Hosea's younger son, his third child. Its etymology, and import xxi

LO-RUHAMAH.

Mystical name of Hosea's daughter, his second child. Its etymology, and import xx

M.

MANUSCRIPTS (Hebrew).

Probable comparative credit of those used by LXX, and those now extant xxxvi

MEMORIAL.

MEMORIAL.

The name of any created thing
never so called 144

METRICAL.

Form of composition in Hosea
lost — xliii

MONARCHY.

A form of government approved
in Holy Writ, and in the He-
roic ages — 45

MOURNERS,

Meat of 30. 102. 109

MOURNING.

Rites of among the Jews and
Heathen — 109

N.

NOMINATIVE ABSOLUTE

xxxii. xxxii. 113. 119

NOVENDIALES EPULÆ

111

NUMBER AND GENDER,

Anomalies of — xxxii

NURSE.

A go-nurse 37. 135. 137

O.

ORCUS,

Equivalent to the Hebrew Sheol
157

P.

PARALLELS,

Singular construction of 154

PARALLELISM,

In Hosea, imperfect and obscure
xlii

PARENTALIA

110

PEACE-OFFERINGS,

Particularly typical of the worship
of the Christian Church 177

ΠΕΡΙΔΕΙΠΝΑ

110

PERSON.

Inconstancy in the person of the
pronoun or verb, a principal
cause of the obscurity imputed
to Hosea's style xxx

PRIAPUS.

Not Baal Peor 119

PRICKERS — 16. 77

PRIDE,

Used to denote an affection of
the mind not criminal 83

PRIEST.

To disobey his judicial decisions
a capital crime 11

Priests taxed with negligence of
their duty — 71

PRIESTHOOD.

Levitical, abolition of it pre-
dicted — 85

PRINCES.

Princes in the Old Testament
not persons of the Royal
Blood. — 85

PRONOUNS.

Ambiguity of. Frequent in the
English Bible, not in the ori-
ginal. — xxxiii

PROPHET.

Manner of Divine communica-
tion with. — 52

F 2

The

The name common to the whole order	—	114	SILICERNIUM	—	111
False pretences to the gift	115	Practised among the Jews	112		
Prevarication in the exercise of the office	—	ibid.	SLAVES.		
Prevaricating Prophet taxed with stupidity and madness	ibid.	Slaves, soldiers, and idolaters, marked with the name of the owner, commander, or God	100		
Abolition of the order predicted	12				
Q.					
QUIESCENT			SOLOMON.		
Verbs quiescent Phe Jod how they form the future Hiphil			King Solomon not himself a worshipper of Moloch	199	
	113				
R.					
RAIN.			SPEAK.		
Former and latter	87		To speak <i>to</i> and speak <i>by</i>	51	
RAMOTH GILEAD.			SPRIT.		
A name distinguishing the city of Gilead from the region of Gilead.	—	90	Lying spirit in the mouth of Ahab's prophets	116	
S.					
SELENE.			STATUE	—	68
Both male and female	113		Starue, Ephod, and Teraphim, as mentioned by Hosea, principal implements of idolatrous rites	—	11. 64—69
SENNACHERIB.					
The destruction of his army not the deliverance of Judah principally intended Hof. i. 7.	2	STICK.	A peeled stick an object of idolatrous worship	196	
SEPTUAGINT.					
The version probably made from incorrect copies of the Hebrew text	—	SUN.	A principal object of idolatry among the Israelites	104	
	xxxvi		The Supreme God of the Heathen	103	
			Its attributes in the Orphic system	103. 104	
		SYRIAC VERSION.			
			Why used by St. Paul in his allusion to Hosea xiii. 14. in preference to the Hebrew text	164. 165	
				T. TALK	

T.

TALK WORDS — 121

TAKE WITH YOU WORDS.

Sense of the phrase 168

ΤΑΦΟΣ.

Differs from Hades, as Keber in
Hebrew from Sheol 159

TARTARUS.

Homer's dungeon of the damned,
distinct from Hades, and be-
low it — 201

TEMPLE.

In what sense the excellency of
Jacob — 84

TERAPHIM.

What — 66—68

V.

VERBS.

Plural terminations of, changed
by suffixes 197. 198

VERSIONS.

Authority of, for introducing va-
rious readings xxxv. 152. 153

Generally over-rated xxxvi

How far sanctioned by citations
in the New Testament 166Consent of in one reading, an
authority of great weight xxxv

VINTAGE.

A type of judgement 21

W.

WEANING.

Weaning of Lo-ruhamah, what xxii

Z.

ZOROBABEL.

Not the one head of Judah and
Israel — 59

ERRATA.

IN HEBREW WORDS.

Page. Line.

74 19. for **הַבְּלִי** read **הַבְּלִי**.
 95 16. for **אֶל** read **עַל**.
 24. for **אֱלֹהָה** read **אֱלֹהָה**.
 102 5. for **בָּה** read **בָּה**.
 108 18. for **אָנוּנוּ** read **אָנוּנוּ**.
 123 1. for **יְנִילּוּ** read **יְנִילּוּ**.
 128 24. for **עַיְנָתָם** read **עַיְנָתָם**.
 135 27. for **תְּרִגְלָתָה** read **תְּרִגְלָתָה**.

IN ENGLISH.

78 21. after "Kal" insert " (or rather, if the Masoretes be right; in Piel)." " makes
 82 9 & 10 for " sometimes drops the final **ת** and makes the plural **מְאֹנָן**" read " makes
 its plural regularly **מְאֹנָן**, and sometimes, even in the singular, drops its
 final **ת**."
 98 22 for "præt." read "fut."
 123 26 after "have" add "had."
 124 12 for "the children" read "the war against the children."
 134 26 for "Bibles" read "Bible."
 140 11 for "brought of" read "brought out of."



A D V E R T I S E M E N T.

THE Author finds, that he owes apology to the orthodox reader, for an omission, not of any thing essential to the elucidation of the Prophet; but in itself of greater moment, than any of the Errata, enumerated in the foregoing list, of the press or of the pen. It is, that he has omitted to add this remark, at the end of the long note on the word "memorial," in chap. xii. 5. [See note (F). p. 143]. Namely; That the person, of whom it is said, that the name JEHOVAH is his memorial, is no other, than he whom the Patriarch found at Bethel, who there spake with the Israelites in the loins of their progenitor. He, whom the Patriarch found at Bethel, who there, in that manner, spake with the Israelites, was, by the tenor of the context, the antagonist with whom Jacob was afterwards matched at Peniel. The antagonist, with whom he was matched at Peniel, wrestled with the Patriarch, as we read in the book of Genesis^a, in the human form. The conflict was no sooner ended, than the Patriarch acknowledged his antagonist as God^b. The Holy Prophet first calls him Angel^c (מֶלֶךְ), and after mention of the colluctation, and of the meeting and conference at Bethel, says^d, that he, whom he had called angel, was "Jehovah God of Hosts." And to make the assertion of this person's Godhead, if possible, still more unequivocal; he adds, that to him belonged, as his appropriate memorial, that name, which is declarative of the very essence of the Godhead. This Man therefore of the book of Genesis, this Angel of Hosea, who wrestled with Jacob, could be no other than the JEHOVAH-ANGEL, of whom we so often read in the English Bible, under the name of the "Angel of the Lord." A phrase of an unfortunate structure, and so ill-conformed to the original, that it is to be feared, it has ledde many into the error of conceiving of the Lord as one person, and of the Angel as another. The word of the Hebrew, ill-rendered "the Lord," is not, like the English word, an appellative, expressing rank, or condition; but it is the proper name JEHOVAH. And this proper name Jehovah is not, in the Hebrew, a genitive after the noun substantive "Angel," as the English represents it; but the words יְהוָה and מֶלֶךְ, "Jehovah" and "Angel," are two nouns substantive in apposition, both speaking of the same person; the one, by the appropriate name of the essence (rendering, by its very etymology, the *λόγος τῆς σοίας*, if it may be permitted to apply logical terms to that which is beyond all the categories); the other, by a title of office. "Jehovah-Angel" would be a better rendering. The JEHOVAH-ANGEL of the Old Testament is no other than He, who, in the fullness of time, "was incarnate by the Holy Ghost of the Virgin Mary".

Certain things have lately appeared in print, in a periodical publication^e, for the soundness of its principles, and the ability with which it is conducted, of the highest merit, by which the author

^a Gen. xxxii. 24.

^b — 30.

^c xii. 4.

^d — 5.

^e Anti-jacobin Review.

thinks himself called upon, in this manner, to supply his great omission. It is very extraordinary, that a writer, not unacquainted with the Hebrew Scriptures, and professing a just abhorrence of the Socinian blasphemy, should insinuate, that not more than one passage of the Old Testament is to be produced, in which Christ is denominated Jehovah. It is more extraordinary, that the attempt to justify the application of that one passage to Christ, should be represented as the attempt of a very modern writer, in which great pains have been *wasted*. When the truth is, that the whole work, in which all these pains have been *wasted*, is comprised in not quite five octavo pages, not closely printed^a: and the object of that short tract is not to make any new application of the passage; but to shew, that the rendering of our English Bible, which expressly makes the application to Christ, is so strongly confirmed by the version of the LXX, in concurrence with all the old versions, that it is for that reason to be preferred to another offered by the learned Dr. Blaney, of which the defender of the old version, too easily perhaps, admits the Hebrew words to be equally susceptible. It is very extraordinary, that this same writer should speak of Dr. Eveleigh's pains, as all employed to prove, that Christ is *once* denominated Jehovah; when the very short tract, in which Dr. Eveleigh defends the old rendering of this one text, is nothing more than an Appendix to his "Discourses on the Doctrine of the Holy Trinity," the 9th and 10th of his Bampton lectures, in which he produces innumerable instances, from the Old Testament, of the application of the divine name Jehovah to the second person in the Godhead. Indeed, the word Jehovah, being descriptive of the Divine Essence, is equally the name of every one of the three persons in that essence. It is applied, in the Old Testament, to every one of them, and to no one more frequently than the second. This matter has been so ably, though briefly, touched by a Presbyter of the Episcopal Church in Scotland in the Anti-jacobin review for May, that it is unnecessary to say more upon it here; except briefly to remark, that the name Jehovah, belonging to the three persons indiscriminately, as simply descriptive of the Essence; the compound JEHOVAH-SABOTH belongs properly to the second person, being his appropriate Demiurgic title; describing not merely *the Lord of such armies as military leaders bring into the field*, but the unmade self-existent Maker and Sustainer of the whole array and order of the universe.

^a See the learned Dr. Eveleigh's Appendix to his 10th Bampton lecture.



ON

CHRIST'S DESCENT INTO HELL,

AND

THE INTERMEDIATE STATE.

A

S E R M O N

ON

1 PETER III. 18, 19, 20.

BY SAMUEL LORD BISHOP OF ST. ASAPH.

1470 OCT 27 THURSDAY 3751.000

6.12

1470 OCT 27 THURSDAY 3751.000

ADVERTISEMENT.

IT seemed particularly proper, that this Sermon should accompany this second edition of *Hosea*, on account of the close connection of the subject, with the Notes upon the Thirteenth Chapter of the Prophet. If it should be said, that, for the same reason, it might have accompanied the first edition; the Author's answer is, that the first edition of *Hosea* was published many months before the Sermon was composed.

1 PETER, iii. 18, 19, 20.

—*Being put to death in the flesh, but quickened by the Spirit :
By which also he went and preached unto the Spirits in Prison,
Which sometime were disobedient, when once the long-suffering of God
waited, in the days of Noah.*—

IN the first rudiments of our Christian Faith, comprised in the Apostles' Creed, which we are made to get by heart in our earliest infancy, we are taught to believe that “our Lord Jesus Christ descended into Hell :” and this belief is solemnly professed, by every member of the congregation, when that creed is repeated in the daily service of the church. And it seemed of so much importance, that it should be distinctly acknowledged by the Church of England, when we separated from the Roman communion ; that our Reformers thought proper to make it by itself the subject of one of the Articles of Religion. They were aware, that upon the fact of our Lord's descent into hell, the church of Rome pretended to build her doctrine of purgatory ; which they justly esteemed one of her worst corruptions. But, apprehensive that the zeal of reformation might, in this as in some other instances, carry men too far, and induce them to reject a most important truth, on which a dangerous error had been once ingrafted ; to prevent this intemperance of reform, they assert in the 3d article of the 39, “That as Christ died for us and was buried, so it is to be believed, “that he went down into Hell.” The terms, in which they state the proposition, imply, that Christ's going down into Hell is a matter of no less importance to be believed, than that he died upon the cross for men ; is no less a plain matter of fact, in the history of our Lord's life and death, than the burial of his dead body. It should seem, that what is thus taught, among the first things which children learn, should be among the plainest. That what

is thus laid down, as a matter of the same necessity to be believed as our Lord's passion and atonement, should be among the least disputed. That what every christian is required to acknowledge, as his own belief, in the daily assemblies of the faithful, should little need either explanation or proof, to any that have been instructed in the very first principles only of the doctrine of Christ. But so it is, that what the sagacity of our reformers foresaw, the precaution, which they used, has not prevented. The truth itself has been brought into discredit by the errors, with which it has been adulterated. And such has been the industry of modern refinement, and unfortunately so great has been its success; that doubts have been raised about the sense of this plain article of our creed by some, and by others about the truth and authenticity of it. It will therefore be no unprofitable undertaking, to shew, that the assertion in the Apostles' creed, that "our Lord descended into Hell," is to be taken as a plain matter of fact in the literal meaning of the words—to shew, what proof of this fact we have in holy writ—and lastly to shew, the great use and importance of the fact, as a point of christian doctrine.

First, then, for the sense of the proposition, "He descended into Hell," if we consider the words as they stand in the creed itself, and in connection with what immediately precedes and follows them; they appear evidently to contain a declaration of something, which our Lord performed, some going of our Lord to a place called "Hell," in the interval of time between the burial of his dead body, and his rising to life again on the third day after that interment. For thus speaks the creed of Jesus Christ. "Was crucified, dead, and buried, He descended into Hell, the third day he rose again from the Dead." It is evident, that the descending into hell is spoken of as an action of our Lord; but as an action performed by him, after he was dead and buried, and before he rose again. In the body our dead Lord, more than any other dead man, could perform no action; for the very notion of death is, that all sensation, and activity, and power of motion of the body, is, in that state of the man, extinguished. This therefore was an act of that part of the man, which continues active after death; that is of the soul separated by death from the body; as the interment must be understood of the body apart from the soul. The dead body could no more go into hell, than the living soul could be laid

in the grave. Considering the words therefore, as they stand in the creed as the church now receives it, they seem as little capable of any variety of meaning, and almost as little to require explanation, as the word “buried.” That word describes not more plainly, to the apprehensions of all men, what was done with the inanimate body of our crucified Lord; than these words declare what was done by his rational soul, in its intermediate state. The only question, that can possibly arise to a plain man’s understanding, is, Where or What the place may be, which is here called Hell, to which, it is said, our Lord, in the state of death, descended?

It is evident, that this must be some place below the surface of the earth. For it is said that he “descended,” that is, he went down to it. Our Lord’s death took place upon the surface of the earth, where the human race inhabit. That therefore, and none higher, is the place from which he descended: of consequence the place, to which he went by descent, was below it. And it is with relation to these parts below the surface, that his rising to life, on the third day, must be understood. This was only a return from the nether regions to the realms of life and day, from which he had descended: not his ascension into Heaven, which was a subsequent event, and makes a distinct article in the Creed.

But although the Hell, to which our Lord descended, was indeed below, as the word descent implies; it is by no means to be understood of the place of Torment. This is a point which requires elucidation, to prevent a mistake into which the unlearned easily might fall. The word “Hell” is so often applied in common speech, and in the English translation of the New Testament, to the place of torment, that the genuine meaning of the word, in which however it is used in many passages of the English Bible, is almost forgotten; and the common people never hear of Hell, but their thoughts are carried to that dismal place, “where the fallen angels are kept in everlasting chains under darkness unto the judgment of the great day.” But the word, in its natural import, signifies only that invisible place, which is the appointed habitation of departed souls, in the interval between death and the general resurrection^a. That

^a See Hosea p. 46, note n.

such a place must be, is indisputable. For when man dieth, his soul dieth not ; but returneth unto him that gave it, to be disposed of at his will and pleasure : which is clearly implied in that admonition of our Saviour, “ Fear not them “ which kill the body, but cannot kill the soul.” But the soul, existing after death and separated from the body, though of a nature immaterial, must be in some place. For however metaphysicians may talk of place, as one of the adjuncts of body, as if nothing but gross sensible body could be limited to a place ; to exist without relation to place, seems to be one of the incommunicable perfections of the Divine Being ; and it is hardly to be conceived, that any created spirit, of however high an order, can be without locality : or without such determination of its existence at any given time to some certain place, that it shall be true to say of it, “ Here it is, and not elsewhere.” That such at least is the condition of the human soul, were it reasonable to go into so abstruse a disquisition, might be proved, I think, indisputably from Holy Writ. Assuming therefore that every departed soul has its place of residence, it would be reasonable to suppose, if revelation were silent on the subject, that a common mansion is provided for them all ; their nature being similar ; since we see, throughout all nature, creatures of the same sort placed together in the same element. But revelation is not silent. The sacred writers of the Old Testament speak of such a common mansion in the inner parts of the earth : and we find the same opinion so general among the heathen writers of antiquity ; that it is more probable, that it had its rise in the earliest patriarchal revelations, than in the imaginations of man, or in poetical fiction. The notion is confirmed by the language of the writers of the New Testament ; with this additional circumstance, that they divide this central mansion of the dead into two distinct regions, for the separate lodging of the souls of the righteous and the reprobate. In this too they have the concurrence of the earliest heathen poets ; who placed the good and the bad in separate divisions of the central region^b. The name which the Hebrew writers gave to this mansion of departed souls (without regard to any such division) expresses only that it is a place unknown, about which all are curious and inquisitive. The writers of the New Testament adopted the name, which the earliest Greek writers had given it, which describes it by the single

^b See Appendix to Critical Notes upon Hosea, N^o II. p. 201.

property of invisibility. But for the place of torment by itself they had quite another appellation. The English word “hell,” in its primary and natural meaning, signifies nothing more than “the unseen and covered place;” and is properly used, both in the Old and the New Testament, to render the Hebrew word in the one, and the Greek word in the other, which denote the invisible mansion of disembodied souls, without any reference to suffering^c. But being used also in the translation of the New Testament for that other word, which properly denotes the place of torment; the good sense of the word, if we may so call it, is unfortunately forgotten, and the common people know of no other hell but that of the burning lake.

This certainly was *not* the hell to which the soul of Christ descended. He descended to hell properly so called, to the invisible mansion of departed spirits, and to that part of it, where the souls of the faithful, when they are delivered from the burthen of the flesh, are in joy and felicity.

That he should go to this place was a necessary branch of the general scheme and project of redemption; which required, that the Divine Word should take our nature upon him, and fulfil the entire condition of humanity, in every period and stage of man’s existence; from the commencement of life, in the mother’s womb, to the extinction and the renovation of it. The same wonderful scheme of humiliation, which required that the Son should be conceived, and born, and put to death; made it equally necessary, that his soul, in its intermediate state, should be gathered to the souls of the departed saints.

That the invisible place of their residence is the Hell, to which our Lord descended, is evident from the terms of his own promise to the repentant thief upon the cross: “Verily I say unto thee, to day shalt thou be with me in “paradise.” Paradise was certainly some place, where our Lord was to be on the very day, on which he suffered; and where the companion of his sufferings was to be with him. It was not Heaven—for to Heaven our Lord after his death ascended not, till after his resurrection; as appears from his own words to Mary Magdalen^d. He was not therefore in heaven on the day of the cru-

^c See Critical Notes on Hosea, chap. xiii. note T, and Appendix N^o II. p. 200—202.

^d John, xx. 17.

crifixion ; and where he was not, the thief could not be with him. It was no place of torment ; for to any such place the name of paradise never was applied. It could be no other, than that region of repose and rest, where the souls of the righteous abide in joyful hope of the consummation of their bliss. And upon this single text we might safely rest the proof of this article of our Creed, in the sense in which we explain it ; a sense so plain and prominent in the bare words, to every one who is not misled by the popular misapplication of the word Hell ; that it never would have been set aside, to make room for expositions of more refinement, much less would the authenticity of the article ever even have been questioned, but for the countenance which it was supposed to give to the doctrine of purgatory, as taught in the Church of Rome ; with which however it has not even a remote connection. Time will not permit me to enter into a particular examination of the different interpretations of this article, which have been attempted by those, who have not gone the length of proposing to expunge it from the Creed ; because they were well aware, that although it is not to be found in any copy of the Creed, now extant, of an earlier date than the latter end of the fourth century ; yet that Christ, in some sense or other, descended into Hell, was the unanimous belief of the Christian Church from the earliest ages. I will offer only this general observation : that the interpretation, which I have given, is the only literal interpretation, which the words will bear ; unless we would admit the extravagant assertion, as to me it seems, of the venerable Calvin, that our blessed Lord actually went down to the place of torment, and there sustained, horrible to think or mention, the pains of a reprobate soul in punishment. A notion evidently confuted by our Lord's own description of the place, where the companion of his sufferings on the cross was to be with him, on the very day of the crucifixion. This sense being thus confuted, I say the personal descent of our Lord to that region, where the souls of the righteous rest in hope, is the only literal interpretation, which the words of the article will bear ; and that any figurative interpretation of the words of a Creed, or formula of faith, are inadmissible. For in such a composition, intended to convey the knowledge of the most important truths to the most ordinary understandings, the ornamental figures of rhetoric, or poetry, would be no less out of place, than in the opinion of a judge upon a question of law, or in a mathematical demonstration. They could have no other effect, than to introduce doubt,

doubt, where every thing ought to be precise and unequivocal. Without entering therefore into a particular confutation of the figurative interpretations, that have been offered, of this article of the creed; I shall proceed at once to shew what proof, we find in scripture, of the fact averred, according to the literal meaning of the words, that "Christ descended into Hell."

This proof rests, I think, principally upon three texts of scripture, in addition to that which I have already mentioned, as affording by itself ample confirmation of the truth of the proposition; namely, our Lord's promise to the penitent thief upon the cross. But there are three other texts, which conspire with this to put the matter out of doubt. The first is that text of the Psalmist, which was alledged by St. Peter in his first sermon on the day of Pentecost, as a prophecy concerning Christ, verified in his resurrection from the dead, "Thou wilt not leave my soul "in hell, neither wilt thou suffer thy Holy One to see corruption^e." The apostle having recited these words of the Psalmist, says, they were not spoken by David of himself, but that David, being a prophet, spake of the resurrection of Christ, that *his* soul was not left in hell, neither did *his* flesh see corruption^f. From this text, if there were no other, the article, in the sense in which we have explained it, is clearly and infallibly deduced. For if the soul of Christ were not left in hell *at* his resurrection; then, it *was* in hell *before* his resurrection. But it was not there either before his death, or after his resurrection; for that never was imagined. Therefore it descended into hell after his death, and before his resurrection. For as his flesh, by virtue of the Divine promise, saw no corruption, although it was in the grave, the place of corruption, where it remained until his resurrection; so his soul, which, by virtue of the like promise, was not left in hell, was *in* that hell, where it was not *left*, until the time came for its re-union to the body for the accomplishment of the resurrection. Hence it is so clearly evinced, that the soul of Christ was in the place called hell, "that none but an infidel," saith St. Augustine, "can "deny it."

^e Psalm xvi. 10.

^f Acts, II. 29-31.

Another text, which carries us to the same conclusion, is in the fourth chapter of St. Paul's epistle to the Ephesians; in the apostle's reasoning upon a passage of the sixty-eighth psalm, which he applies as prophetic of the various gifts, which Christ, after his ascension, conferred upon the members of his church. The Psalmist speaks to this effect, as he is cited by the apostle: "When he ascended up on high, he led captivity captive, and gave gifts unto men." "Now that he ascended," says the apostle, arguing upon the Psalmist's words, "what is it, but that he descended first into the lower parts of the earth?" Intimating, that the ascending up on high, of which the psalmist speaks, is to be understood in reference to a previous descent into the lowest regions, as its opposite.

Some however have imagined, that the descent into hell is not to be deduced from this text, with the same certainty as from the former. They imagine something of ambiguity in the phrase of "the lower parts of the earth." Rightly referring the ascending up on high to our Lord's ascension into heaven; they think, that "the lower parts of the earth" may signify the earth generally, as lower than the heavens; and even nothing lower, than the very surface of it. And it must be confessed, that our Lord speaks of himself before his death, while he was living upon the surface of the earth, as having come down to it from heaven. Nevertheless "the lower parts of the earth" in the Greek language, in which the apostle writes, is a periphrasis for "hell" in the proper sense of that word, as the invisible mansion of departed spirits. The phrase is so perfectly equivalent to the word "hell," that we find it used, instead of that word, in some of the Greek copies of the Creed, in this very article; where the mention of our Lord's coming down from heaven, to dwell upon the earth, would be quite out of place, after the mention of the several events of his birth, crucifixion, death, and burial, in their natural order and succession. But indeed this phrase of the "lower parts of the earth" is, in the Greek language, so much a name for the central parts of the globe, as distinguished from the surface, or the outside, on which we live; that had the apostle intended by this phrase to denote the inhabited surface of the earth, as lower than the

^g Ephesians, IV. 7-10.

heavens;

heavens; we may confidently say, his Greek convert at Ephesus would not easily have guessed his meaning. This text therefore, when the Greek words are taken in the only sense, in which any writer in that language would have used, or any one, who spoke the language, would have understood them, expressly affirms a descent of Christ's spirit into Hell.

A third scripture, which goes to the proof of the same fact, is, that very remarkable passage in the third chapter of St. Peter's first epistle, which I have chosen for my text. I might mention as a fourth^h, another passage in the following chapter of the same epistle, which alludes to the same event; but not, I think, with equal certainty: for the sense of that following passage is indeed dependant upon this; insomuch that any figurative interpretation, which would invalidate the argument we shall deduce from this first passage, would in equal degree affect the second: and no proof can be drawn from that of Christ's descent into Hell, if none can be previously found in the words of my text.

But in them, taken in their most literal and obvious meaning, we find not only a distinct assertion of the fact, that "Christ descended into Hell" in his disembodied spirit, but moreover a declaration of the business, upon which he went thither; or in which, at least, his soul was employed while it was there: "being put to death in the flesh, but quickened by the Spirit." "By which also he went and preached unto the spirits in prison, which sometime were disobedient." The interpretation of this whole passage turns upon the expression "Spirits in prison;" the sense of which I shall first, therefore, endeavour to ascertain, as the key to the meaning of the whole. It is hardly necessary to mention, that "Spirits" here can signify no other spirits than the souls of men. For we read not of any preaching of Christ to any other race of beings than mankind. The apostle's assertion, therefore, is this; that Christ "went and preached to souls of men in prison." The invisible mansion of departed spirits, though certainly not a place of penal confinement to the good, is nevertheless, in some respects, a prison. It is a place of seclusion from the external world; a place of unfinished happiness, consisting in rest, security, and

^h Peter, iv. 6.

hope, more than enjoyment. It is a place, which the souls of men never would have entered, had not sin introduced death ; and from which there is no exit by any natural means, for those who once have entered. The deliverance of the Saints from it is to be effected by our Lord's power. It is described in the old Latin language, as a place inclosed within an impaffable fence ; and, in the poetical parts of scripture, it is represented as secured by gates of brass, which our Lord is to batter down ; and barricadoed with huge massive iron bars, which he is to cut in funder. As a place of confinement, therefore, though not of punishment, it may well be called a prisonⁱ. The original word, however, in this text of the apostle, imports not of necessity so much as this ; but merely a place of safe-keeping : for so this passage might be rendered with great exactness. “ He went and preached to the spirits in safe-keeping.” And the invisible mansion of departed souls is to the righteous a place of safe-keeping, where they are preserved under the shadow of God's right hand, as their condition sometimes is described in scripture, till the season shall arrive for their advancement to their future glory ; as the souls of the wicked, on the other hand, are reserved, in the other division of the same place, unto the judgement of the great day. Now if Christ went and preached to souls of men thus in prison, or in safe-keeping ; surely he went to the prison of those souls, or to the place of their custody. And what place that should be, but the Hell of the Apostles' Creed to which our Lord descended ; I have not yet met with the critic that could explain. So clearly does this text affirm the fact of Christ's descent into Hell.

But this is not all : it agrees with the Apostle's Creed in the time of this event ; that it was in the interval between our Lord's death and resurrection. For the apostle affirms, that it was in his spirit, *i.e.* in his disembodied soul, that Christ went and preached to those souls in safe custody. “ Being put to death in the flesh, but quickened by the spirit.” “ Quickened by the spirit.” The spirit, in these English words, seems to be put, not for the soul of Christ, but for the Divine Spirit. And the sense seems to be, that Christ, after he was put to death, was raised to life again by the Holy Spirit. But this, though it be the sense of the English translation, and a true proposition, is

ⁱ See Critical Notes upon Hosea, chap. xiii. note T.

certainly

certainly not the sense of the apostle's words. It is of great importance to remark, though it may seem a grammatical nicety, that the prepositions, in either branch of this clause, have been supplied by the translators, and are not in the original. The words "flesh" and "spirit," in the original, stand, without any preposition, in that case, which, in the Greek language, without a preposition, is the case either of the cause or instrument, by which ; of the time when ; of the place where ; of the part in which ; of the manner how ; or of the respect in which ; according to the exigence of the context. And, to any one who will consider the original with critical accuracy, it will be obvious from the perfect antithesis of these two clauses, concerning flesh and spirit; that if the word spirit denote the active cause, by which Christ was restored to life, which must be supposed by them who understand the word of the Holy Ghost; the word "flesh" must equally denote the active cause, by which he was put to death: which therefore must have been the flesh of his own body. An interpretation too manifestly absurd to be admitted. But if the word "flesh" denote, as it most evidently does, the part in which death took effect upon him; "spirit" must denote the part in which life was preserved in him, *i. e.* his own soul. And the word "quickened" is often applied to signify, not the resuscitation of life extinguished, but the preservation and continuance of life subsisting. The exact rendering, therefore, of the apostle's words would be, "being put to death in the flesh, but quick in the spirit;" *i. e.* surviving in his soul the stroke of death, which his body had sustained, "by which," rather in "which," that is, in which surviving soul, he went and preached to the souls of men in prison, or in safe-keeping.

It is not to be wondered, that this text should have been long considered in the church as one of the principal foundations of the catholic belief of Christ's descent into Hell. It is rather to be wondered, that so clear a proof should ever have been abandoned. In the articles of religion agreed upon in convocation in the year 1552, the 6th of Edward VI. and published by the king's authority the year following; the Third Article is in these words: "As Christ died and was "buried for us, so also it is to be believed that he went down into hell; for "the body lay in the sepulchre until the resurrection, but his ghost, departing "from him, was with the ghosts that were in prison, or in hell, as the place of

“ St. Peter doth testify.” But in the short interval of ten years, between this convocation in the reign of Edward and the setting forth of the Thirty-nine Articles in their present form in the 5th of queen Elizabeth, a change seems to have taken place in the opinions of the Divines of our church, with respect to this text of St. Peter. For in the articles, as they were then drawn, and we now have them, Christ's descent into hell is still asserted ; but the proof of it from the text of St. Peter is withdrawn. As if the literal sense of the text, which affords the proof, had fallen under suspicion, and some other exposition of it had been adopted. This change of opinion, I fear, is to be ascribed to an undue reliance of the Divines of that time, on the authority of St. Austin. For St. Austin was, I think, the first who doubted of the literal sense of this passage of St. Peter. He perplexes himself with some questions, which seemed to him to arise out of it, of too great subtlety perhaps to be solved by man, and then he had recourse to the usual but dangerous expedient of abandoning the plain meaning of the passage for some loose figurative interpretation, which presents a proposition of no sort of difficulty to the understanding of the critic, because in truth it is a proposition of his own making. I mean not to deprecate the character of St. Austin. He was, indeed, in his day, a burning and a shining light ; and he has been ever since, by his writings, one of the brightest luminaries of the Latin church. A man of warm unaffected piety, of the greatest natural talents, and the highest attainments ; exercised in the assiduous study of the Holy Scriptures, replete with sacred learning, and withal deeply versed in that Pagan lore, in which, however it may have been of late shamefully calumniated, the soundest Divines have always been great proficients. In polite literature he was the rival, in science and philosophy, the superior, by many degrees, of his great contemporary St. Jerome. But it was a culpable deference to the authority even of so great and good a man, if his doubts were in any case turned into objections, and the interpretation of scripture adjusted to opinions, which he himself propounds with doubt and hesitation. Those, in later times, who have improved upon St. Austin's hint of figuring this passage, have succeeded no better than they, who have made the like attempt upon the article of our Lord's descent in the Creed. They tell us, that, by the souls in prison, are to be understood the gentile world in bondage and captivity to sin and satan, and held in the chains of their own lusts. And for confirmation of this,

this, they refer to those passages of the prophet Isaiah in which it is predicted of Christ, “ that he is to bring the prisoners out of prison, and them that sit in darkness out of the prison house;—That he is to say to the prisoners, go forth^k—That he is to proclaim liberty to the captives, and the opening of the prison to those that are bound^l.”

Now we deny not, that the state of the unregenerate carnal man is indeed represented in Scripture under the images of captivity and bondage; and his sinful lusts, under the images of chains and fetters. But with respect to the alleged passages from the prophet Isaiah, in the last of them most indubitably, and I believe in all, but in the last without doubt, the prison is no other than that self-same place, which is the prison or place of safe-keeping in this text of St. Peter according to our notion of it. The enlargement of the saints, from the confinement of that place, is the liberation predicted. Their souls in that place are the captives, to whom the Redeemer, at the season of his final triumph over death and hell, shall say, “ Go Forth.” These texts of the prophet, therefore, rather afford a confirmation of the literal acceptation of the apostle’s words; than of those jejune figurative interpretations, which modern criticism, scared at the bug-bear of purgatory, would substitute for the plain and obvious sense.

It cannot, however, be dissembled, that difficulties arise out of the particular character of the souls in custody, to which I shall give such consideration as the time will permit.

The souls in custody, to whom our Saviour went, in his disembodied soul, and preached, were those “ which sometime were disobedient.” The expression “ sometime were,” or “ one while had been” disobedient, implies that they were recovered however from that disobedience, and before their death had been brought to repentance and faith in the Redeemer to come. To such souls he went and preached. But what did he preach to departed souls, and what could be the end of his preaching? Certainly he preached neither repentance nor faith; for the preaching of either comes too late to the departed soul. These souls had believed and repented, or they had not been in that part of the nether re-

^j Isaiah, xlii. 7.

^k Isaiah xlix. 9.

^l Isaiah, lxi. 8.

gions, which the soul of the Redeemer visited. Nor was the end of his preaching any liberation of them from we know not what purgatorial pains, of which the Scriptures give not the slightest intimation. But if he went to proclaim to them (and to proclaim or publish is the true sense of the word, to preach) the glad tidings, that he had actually offered the sacrifice of their redemption, and was about to appear before the Father as their intercessor, in the merit of his own blood; this was a preaching fit to be addressed to departed souls, and would give new animation and assurance to their hope of the consummation, in due season, of their bliss; and this, it may be presumed, was the end of his preaching. But the great difficulty in the description of the souls, to whom this preaching for this purpose was addressed, is this; that they were souls of some of the antediluvian race. Not that it at all startles me, to find antediluvian souls in safe-keeping for final salvation. On the contrary, I should find it very difficult to believe (unless I were to read it somewhere in the Bible), that of the millions that perished in the general deluge, all died hardened in impenitence and unbelief; insomuch that not one of that race could be an object of future mercy, beside the eight persons who were miraculously saved in the ark, for the purpose of repeopling the depopulated earth. Nothing in the general plan of God's dealings with mankind, as revealed in Scripture, makes it necessary to suppose, that, of the antediluvian race, who might repent upon Noah's preaching, more would be saved from the temporal judgement, than the purpose of a gradual repopulation of the world demanded; or to suppose, on the other hand, that all, who perished in the flood, are to perish everlasting in the lake of fire. But the great difficulty, of which, perhaps, I may be unable to give any adequate solution, is this: For what reason should the proclamation of the finishing of the great work of redemption, be addressed exclusively to the souls of these antediluvian penitents? Were not the souls of the penitents of later ages equally interested in the joyful tidings? To this I can only answer, that I think I have observed, in some parts of Scripture, an anxiety, if the expression may be allowed, of the sacred writers to convey distinct intimations, that the antediluvian race is not uninterested in the redemption, and the final retribution. It is for this purpose, as I conceive, that, in the description of the general resurrection, in the visions of the Apocalypse, it is mentioned, with a particular emphasis, that the " sea gave up the dead that were in it;" which I cannot be

content

content to understand of the few persons, few in comparison of the total of mankind, lost at different times by shipwreck ; a poor circumstance to find a place in the midst of the magnificent images, which surround it ; but of the myriads who perished in the general deluge, and found their tomb in the waters of that raging ocean. It may be conceived, that the souls of those who died in that dreadful visitation, might, from that circumstance, have peculiar apprehensions of themselves, as the marked victims of divine vengeance, and might peculiarly need the consolation, which the preaching of our Lord in the subterranean regions afforded to these prisoners of hope. However that may be, thither the apostle says, he went and preached. Is any difficulty, that may present itself to the human mind, upon the circumstances of that preaching, of sufficient weight, to make the thing unfit to be believed upon the word of the apostle ? Or are we justified, if, for such difficulties, we abandon the plain sense of the apostle's words, and impose upon them another meaning, not easily adapted to the words, though more proportioned to the capacity of our understanding ? Especially when it is confirmed by other Scriptures, that he went to that place. In that place he could not but find the souls, which are in it in safe-keeping ; and, in some way or other, it cannot but be supposed, that he would hold conference with them ; and a particular conference with one class, might be the means, and certainly could be no obstruction, to a general communication with all. If the clear assertions of Holy Writ are to be discredited, on account of difficulties which may seem, to the human mind, to arise out of them ; little will remain to be believed in revealed, or even in what is called natural religion. We must immediately part with the doctrines of atonement ; of gratuitous redemption ; of justification by faith, without the works of the law ; of sanctification by the influence of the Holy Spirit ; and we must part at once with the hope of the resurrection. How are the dead raised up, and with what body do they come ? are questions more easily asked than answered, unless it may be an answer, to refer the proposer of them to the promises of Holy Writ, and the power of God, to make good those promises.

Having now, I trust, shewn that the article of Christ's descent into hell, is to be taken as a plain matter of fact, in the literal meaning of the words ; having exhibited the positive proof that we find of this fact in Holy Writ ; having asserted

asserted the literal meaning of my text, and displayed, in its full force, the convincing proof to be deduced from this passage in particular; I shall now, with great brevity, demonstrate the great use and importance of the fact itself, as a point of christian doctrine.

Its great use is this: That it is a clear confutation of the dismal notion of death, as a temporary extinction of the life of the whole man; or, what is no less gloomy and discouraging, the notion of the sleep of the soul in the interval between death and the resurrection. Christ was made so truly man, that whatever took place in the human nature of Christ, may be considered as a model and example of what must take place, in a certain due proportion and degree, in every man united to him. Christ's soul survived the death of his body. Therefore shall the soul of every Believer survive the body's death. Christ's disembodied soul descended into Hell. Thither, therefore, shall the soul of every Believer in Christ descend. In that place, the soul of Christ, in its separate state, possessed and exercised active powers. In the same place, therefore, shall the Believer's soul possess and exercise activity. Christ's soul was not left in Hell. Neither shall the souls of his servants there be left, but for a season. The appointed time will come, when the Redeemer shall set open the doors of their prison-house, and say to his redeemed, " GO FORTH."

BS1565 .H818 1804
Hosea : translated from the Hebrew, with

Princeton Theological Seminary-Speer Library



1 1012 00078 6527

